

Also, petition of Frederick Kaufmann and 50 others; Frank Meissner and 74 others; Evangelical Zion's Church, of Mount Clemens; J. W. Leipprandt and 134 others, of Pigeon; Charles Brandt and 38 others; Ernest R. Wolf and 19 others; Henry Graichen and 4 others; Charles J. Wolf and 36 others; George Schroeder and 5 others; also telegrams from J. Murray, H. H. Powers, E. J. Smith, F. J. Wargowsky, Clarence Kellogg, Dr. C. R. Osius, and Rev. Rausch, all of Port Huron; the three Evangelical Lutheran congregations of the township of Sebewaing; C. C. Haug, pastor of St. John's Church, of Port Huron; Citizens' League of Richville; the Hemmeter Cigar Co., of Detroit; Citizens' League of Reese; St. John's Church, of Pigeon, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the United States becoming a party to the European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Charles K. Blatchly, employment secretary, the Prison Association of New York, favoring Senate bill 1092 and House bill 42; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Clarence M. Smith, of New York, and Lucy Loud Ellis, of Pendleton, Oreg., favoring the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of St. Louis Medical Society, opposing Senate joint resolution 120; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Rising Sun Council, No. 52, Luxemburg, Mo., opposing House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of R. A. Craig and 110 other citizens of Alameda County, against House bill 13048, to create a juvenile court in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of R. A. Craig and 42 other citizens of Alameda County, protesting against House bill 652, to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Good Roads Association of Wisconsin, urging the necessity of the early designation, construction, and maintenance of a system of national highways to be built and maintained by the National Government; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of automobile manufacturers of New York, protesting against the enactment of the Tavenner bill, House bill 8665, or any similar measure; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Lithuanians of Greater Boston, condemning certain acts of Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: Memorial of sundry citizens of Waterbury, Conn., favoring permanent international tribunal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOOD: Memorial of board of directors of the Marshalltown Club, indorsing House resolution 175; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Papers to accompany House bill 13738, for relief of Robert W. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 15890, to increase the pension of Louise Mawling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: Papers in the case of George Rutherford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of E. H. Parker and others of Birmingham, Ala., in re House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Will D. Root and others of Birmingham, Ala., in re Senate bill 645; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Rev. H. Reuter and others, of Birmingham, Ala., in re House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of 15 citizens of Clio, Mich., against certain amendments to the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Memorial of the Maryland Antivivisection Society of Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 11079; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of D. E. Wade and 51 other citizens of McLure and Wagerville Townships, Gladwin County, Mich., for passage of House joint resolutions 84 and 85; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Messrs. William Stemrick, N. Murray, C. Lyons, C. F. Kemney, and others, all of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the Lobeck classification bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGEE (by request): Petition of citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., opposing House bills 491 and 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorials of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of California, favoring the reporting out of the Susan B. Anthony suffrage amendment from the Judiciary Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Protestant Churches Association of Greater New York City, opposing war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, report on pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, opposing the Tavenner or similar bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of James S. McCabe, of Providence, R. I., favoring the resolution requesting the President to designate a day on which funds may be raised for the relief of the Armenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Phoebe L. Cargill, of Providence, R. I., favoring Senate bill 4874; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of citizens of first congressional district of New Hampshire, favoring Senate concurrent resolution No. 12, granting relief to suffering citizens of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of sundry citizens of Grand Junction, Colo., favoring the passage of House bill 8665, to regulate working conditions for skilled labor in Government service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of Grand Junction, Colo., protesting against passage of bills to amend the postal laws in relation to religion; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Piper & Fullerton Co., Beaver Falls, Pa., favoring House bill 13916, laying an embargo upon crude petroleum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of A. Chattaway, of Hazzard, Pa., favoring increase of compensation for fourth-class postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of John Connell and 22 others, of Meriden, Conn., urging Congress to pass House bill 8665, to prevent the introduction of efficiency systems in Government workshops; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 24, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 18, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Myers	Smoot
Bankhead	Gallinger	Nelson	Sterling
Borah	Hardwick	Norris	Sutherland
Brandegee	Hollis	O'Gorman	Swanson
Broussard	Husting	Overman	Taggart
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poinexter	Thomas
Chilton	Jones	Ransdell	Thompson
Clapp	Kenyon	Shafroth	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Sheppard	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Sherman	Wadsworth
Culberson	Lane	Simmons	Warren
Curtis	Len, Tenn.	Smith, Ariz.	
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. Goff] is absent unavoidably to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Out of order I ask unanimous consent to submit a favorable report from the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received.

M. A. SWEENEY SHIPYARDS & FOUNDRY CO.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13064) for the relief of the M. A. Sweeney Shipyards & Foundry Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 478) thereon.

FOREIGN-BUILT DREDGES.

Mr. RANDELL. Out of order I ask leave to submit a report from the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the report will be received.

Mr. RANDELL. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4797) to amend an act entitled "An act concerning foreign-built dredges," approved May 28, 1906, to report it favorably without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 479) thereon.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill just reported from the Committee on Commerce. It is to permit an American contractor to bring in two dredges which he had occasion to use on some work in Canada. All the material used in the construction of the dredges was produced in the United States. The assembling of the material was done in Canada. The bill gives the Secretary of Commerce discretion as to the imposition of terms and conditions on which the dredges may be brought into this country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to amend the act entitled "An act concerning foreign-built dredges," approved May 28, 1906, by adding, at the end of section 1, the following words: "or unless permitted by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, on such terms and conditions as he may impose."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, various statements have been made by individuals and reported in the press concerning the financial condition of the State of Colorado and the city of Denver, which condition, it was claimed, has been produced by woman suffrage. I have a statement here signed by 70 of the prominent business men of the city of Denver, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not want to have the 70 names printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; they are very prominent men, comprising the bankers, the wholesale merchants, bond brokers, and other business men. Their very names will produce conviction as to the absolute verity of their statement. The charge was made that the credit of the State of Colorado was impaired, which is an absolute falsehood. Then leading men have taken the trouble to get up a statement of this kind, which shows that the standing of the city of Denver and the State of Colorado in finances is as good as that of any city or State in the Union. Their bonded indebtedness is insignificant compared to the wealth of that city and State. It would be well for States having only manhood suffrage to take notice of this condition in an equal-suffrage State. I should like very much to have the statement inserted, with the names of the signers.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the insertion of the statement, but I thought the statement of the Senator was sufficient to describe the character of the signers, and that it would be useless to take up that much space in the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It is very short—all on one page. The statement is signed by men well known throughout the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT COLORADO.

Because various irresponsible persons, in no way representing the real spirit of Colorado, have circulated statements defamatory to the credit of the State and its womanhood, we believe the time has come when all such silly and slanderous stories should be repudiated by the intelligent and public-spirited men of the State of Colorado.

The demand for Colorado bonds is far greater than the supply. In per capita wealth, in expenditures for education, in the percentage of homes without encumbrance, in public improvements in all matters affecting social welfare and the humane side of legislation, Colorado stands well to the front, as may easily be verified by the reports of the United States Government.

In all efforts that have served to forward the health and prosperity of the State the women of Colorado have done their share. The enfranchisement of women is no longer a question here. Equal suffrage was granted by popular vote in 1893 and incorporated in the constitution 10 years later by a majority three times the size of that given the original referendum.

H. J. Alexander, president First National Bank; J. A. Thatcher, president Denver National Bank; George B. Berger, president Colorado National Bank; Godfrey Schirmer, president German-American Trust Co.; W. J. Galligan, president City Bank & Trust Co.; John Evans, president International Trust Co.; James C. Burger, president Hamilton National Bank; Frank N. Briggs,

president Interstate Trust Co.; James H. Causey, banker and investment bonds; Gordon Jones, United States National Bank; C. B. Whitehead, bonds and investments; Persifor M. Cooke, banking; E. J. Weckbach, banking; Hume Lewis, of Boettcher, Porter & Co., bond dealers; C. K. Boettcher, Boettcher, Porter & Co.; John H. Porter, Boettcher, Porter & Co.; M. C. Harrington, president Hibernia Bank; W. M. Marshall, president Central Savings Bank & Trust Co.; C. MacA. Willcox, vice president Daniels & Fisher Stores Co.; W. R. Owen, vice president the Denver Dry Goods Co.; H. M. Stoll, the Joslin Dry Goods Co.; A. D. Lewis, the A. T. Lewis & Son Dry Goods Co.; Meyer Neusteter, the Neusteter Co.; Frederick W. Hedgcock, president Hedgcock & Jones Specialty Store Co.; Wm. I. Mead, manager the May Co.; A. Glesecke, president Denver Music Co.; V. G. Campbell, the Knight-Campbell Music Co.; H. M. Williamson, president Davis Chemical Co.; Alfred T. Bowen, Davis Chemical Co.; George E. Turner, Turner Moving & Storage Co.; C. A. Kendrick, president Kendrick-Bellamy Co., stationers; A. J. Spengel, president Spengel House Furnishing Co.; W. H. Kistler, president W. H. Kistler Stationery Co.; E. L. Scholtz, the Scholtz Drug Co.; O. L. Smith, Jr., vice president Smith-Brooks Printing Co.; Jesse W. Wheelock, general manager Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Henry Van Kleeck, mortgages and investments; Zeph Charles Felt, real estate; George S. Van Law, real estate and loans; E. W. Merritt, real estate and loans; Cass E. Herrington, legal department Colorado Fuel & Iron Co.; O. E. Lefevre, ex-district judge, retired capitalist; Charles D. Hayt, attorney, ex-judge supreme court; Charles M. Deardorff, attorney; J. B. Grant, attorney; Henry May, attorney; Frank E. Gove, attorney; A. N. Patton, attorney; Alva A. Swain, Pueblo Chieftain and Grand Junction News; Carlos M. Cole, superintendent public schools; William H. Smiley, supervisor high schools; J. M. Downen, Clayton School for Boys; John B. Garvin, instructor East Denver High School; C. A. Brooks, past national patriotic instructor, Grand Army of the Republic; S. A. Ritter Brown, author and capitalist; James A. Beebe, president Iliff School of Theology; S. B. Longacre, dean Iliff School of Theology; Borden P. Kessler, instructor Iliff School of Theology; Charles O. Thibodeau, pastor Grace Methodist Episcopal Church; T. E. McGuire, pastor Park Hill Methodist Episcopal Church; James Thomas, pastor Grant Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church; Orrin W. Auman, district superintendent Denver District Methodist Episcopal Churches; H. R. A. O'Malley, rector St. Stephen's Church; S. R. S. Gray, vicar West Denver; James Rae Arnell, M. D.; O. D. Wescott, M. D.; Edw. Wm. Lazell, M. D.; the City Federation (a delegate organization of the Associated Charities, Ministerial Alliance, and nearly 50 other societies of Denver, instructed its president and secretary to sign the foregoing statement), by Dr. Clinton G. Hickey, president, and Walter C. Heckendorf, secretary.

DENVER, COLO., May 10, 1916.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask that the river and harbor bill may be laid before the Senate and proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12193) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I rise this morning for the purpose of addressing the Senate on the so-called river and harbor bill, and I expect at the end of my remarks to offer a motion to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to report out a bill in a sum not exceeding \$20,000,000. In support of that motion which I propose to make I now address myself.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. HUSTING. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Do I understand that the Senator is moving to recommit the bill?

Mr. HUSTING. I shall move to recommit the bill at the end of my remarks.

Mr. NELSON. I was going to suggest to the Senator that there are a few more amendments to be offered, and we had better complete the bill before a motion is made to recommit it. I would ask the Senator to postpone the motion until we have finished the bill, and then his motion to recommit would be more appropriate.

Mr. HUSTING. Perhaps the Senator is right from his point of view, but from mine I think this is the appropriate time. That is my humble judgment.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I quite agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that if the bill is going to be recommitted it had better be recommitted at this point.

Mr. HUSTING. I was going to say in explanation of that that if the bill is going to be recommitted it had better, it seems to me, be recommitted before we spend any further time in the consideration of the bill. All the committee amendments are now in, and the Senate is informed of the type of bill which the committee proposes to pass.

Mr. President, in opposing this bill I should like to be understood as not opposing any particular appropriation in the bill or of commending any particular appropriation in the bill, because I am opposing this sort of a bill in its entirety. There may be and undoubtedly are very meritorious projects in the bill. I do not think there is any doubt that there are a great many projects in the bill that have little or no merit whatever, and that the Government is spending its money in a wasteful and extravagant manner in carrying all the projects which are proposed in the bill.

In a matter of this kind, although Wisconsin in a measure is interested primarily, I have voted in at least one instance against a proposal to increase the appropriation for the Mississippi River from \$1,250,000 to \$1,500,000. I voted that way because I do not know whether it is needed or is to be wisely expended. If it is a good thing I am sure that standing alone those favoring it will be able to vindicate that appropriation. If we spend money only to aid in meritorious projects merit will get a better hearing when standing alone, and the project will get more money when standing alone than it can possibly get if we are going to divide the funds which ought to be expended for meritorious projects among a great many others of little or no merit whatever. I, for one, am willing to let the Wisconsin projects or those affecting Wisconsin stand on their own legs. If there is any project which concerns Wisconsin immediately I am willing to have that particular measure stand or fall on its own merits.

I am sure that whatever is to be expended here in the improvement of harbors along Lake Michigan is good and will stand alone, and not only that but I believe that those harbors are worthy of a greater expenditure of money than has heretofore been made on them. As a matter of self-enlightened interest for Wisconsin and Wisconsin projects I say I want to disapprove any bill which uses any meritorious scheme in which Wisconsin may be interested as a stalking horse or a bait for any other project which has no merit.

I am sorry to hold the opinion that it has been the practice in the past—I guess that is not seriously disputed; in fact, some of the things that have arisen in the discussion of the pending bill warrant me, I think, in believing it—that sometimes meritorious measures are left out of the bill in order to coerce, or rather to persuade, those particularly interested in such projects in voting for some other project that has no merit whatever, in order to secure its own just demands. That is a practice that is not only bad, but which leads to extravagance and to the expenditure of money for many improper projects. So, I say, in discussing this matter I want to object chiefly to the system that is in operation here, to the method used in attempting to pass a river and harbor appropriation bill.

There has been expended, I am informed, \$850,000,000 on river and harbor projects. It has been, as has already been stated here and as everybody knows, a hit-and-miss proposition. It is a sum here and a sum there and a sum some other place of so many million dollars a year, so that altogether a grand total of \$850,000,000 has been reached in river and harbor projects; certainly a most stupendous sum, and a sum which, if it had been properly expended, should show results somewhat commensurate with the immense sum of money which has been expended. I repeat, it has been a hit-or-miss proposition.

A great deal of criticism that can be directed against our whole waterways proposition—or rather lack of one—can be directed against a river and harbor scheme of this kind. It gets us nowhere; it never will get us anywhere; it accomplishes nothing, except to take money out of the Treasury and to squander it for a great many unworthy purposes.

This is not a party question. The parties ought not to divide upon this proposition, and I, for one, would like to discuss it from a nonpartisan standpoint. Our friends on the other side have insisted all along that it is a nonpartisan question and that they propose to discuss it from a nonpartisan standpoint, although the record will show that not all of the Senators, yet a number of them, have injected into their remarks speeches of a highly partisan nature. They have taken occasion to call into this discussion the Mexican question, the European question, and a great many other questions.

Before proceeding any further I want to say a few words about that. The trouble with a great many of the appropriations which a Democratic Congress has been obliged to make is that they have been made necessary to carry out a great many of the extravagant measures instituted by a Republican administration. The consequence of extravagant appropriations does not always stop with the administration that is responsible for them, but it continues on and on for a great many years. Projects are started, first, in a river and harbor bill calling for an immediate small appropriation, but the project

involves a possible expenditure, as I think the record will show and as I think I can show a little later on, of hundreds of millions of dollars. So projects have been started under former administrations carrying with them appropriations for the immediate needs of a project which has been started, but which, in the end, is going to involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. That is not our fault, but it is the fault of those who started the project. Of course the argument now is that, having put in ten or twenty or thirty or forty or fifty million dollars, it is the duty of a Democratic administration to continue the appropriation.

If our friends on the other side wanted to be fair about it, they would at least acknowledge the corn, and say "We want you to continue these things, but we admit that we are responsible for them." But what do they do? They hold up before our eyes the threat that if we pass the appropriations they are going to charge us with extravagance, and if we abandon them they are going to charge us with "scuttling the ship." They have done that in reference to the Philippine question, which is something that we have inherited from a Republican administration. They foisted onto our necks something that is costing us I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars—I believe about \$300,000,000—but when we are trying to separate ourselves from what has proven to be an incubus, we are charged with scuttling the ship. If we continue to pay the money that the Philippines cost us, they are charging that up as a part of Democratic extravagance.

I might cite the Mexican question, another thing that we have inherited from our Republican friends. It is a matter that they did not settle, but which they handed down as a legacy from their administration. In this debate Senators on the other side have been talking about the cowardice of a Democratic administration, and have complained that we have not gone to war with Mexico; that we have not intervened; that we have not sent down 250,000 men to invade Mexico. If we had taken their advice and taken care of the situation in the manner in which they have suggested, our appropriations would have sprung up to a great many hundreds of millions more than they are already amounting to. If we had taken their advice and gone into and invaded Mexico and expended a half billion dollars, they would charge that up to Democratic extravagance. If we do not do it, we are charged with cowardice, and with a failure to do our duty. If we do what they deem to be our duty and spend the money, then we are extravagant, they say.

In this connection, I might say that our Republican friends have not hesitated to inject into this debate the European question.

Others on the other side contend that we should have gone to war with Germany in defense of Belgium's neutrality. If we had done that, the sum total of the appropriation bills would amount to billions of dollars and the bills which we shall pass this session would "look like 30 cents."

I am not going into a discussion of that any further than to show the bearing that this charge of extravagance, coming from the Republican side of the Chamber, has on the necessities of the country. In short, the criticisms which have been made amount to this: That if we do not do a certain thing, we are this, that, or some other thing, and if we do what they suggest we ought to do, then we are guilty of unwarrantable extravagance; in other words, we will be "damned if we do and be damned if we don't." So it seems to me that it will be impossible for us to satisfy the Senators on the other side, or at least some of them, and consequently I presume the only thing that is left for us to do is to try to satisfy the people of this country, which is, of course, of the first importance and the other only of secondary or more remote importance. Therefore I want to speak with regard to this bill from the standpoint of what I conceive to be the interest of the people, disassociated from any possible partisan tinge, for, in a large way, it is nonpartisan. Those supporting this bill are nonpartisan except in the sense that in this bill and bills of like nature their interests, or what they conceive to be their interests, are tied up together and party lines are not drawn, nor are sectional lines.

A great deal of time has been consumed in the discussion of this bill and a great deal of information has been put into the Record. I do not think that anyone can have listened to the indictments against this bill or the facts as portrayed here without feeling that this bill in its entirety ought not to pass. I do not think that this Government at this time, when it is engaged, and must continue to be engaged for some time at least, in extraordinary expenditures for preparedness, both in the way of defense and also in an industrial way, in the way of spreading our commerce to the four corners of the globe and providing for contingencies of a grave and great nature which

now confront us, ought to expend money that is going to be needed so badly elsewhere in the development of small or insignificant creeks or rivers.

I think, in consonance with the general purpose of this Congress, that every river and harbor project ought to be made a part of a harmonious whole from a military and commercial standpoint and ought to be made to harmonize with the general spirit of preparedness in the way of preparing this country to compete with the world, either in a contest of arms, if it should come, or in a contest of commerce when it shall come, as it is bound to come. Everything else ought to be stricken out of this bill, ought to be sidetracked for the moment, or entirely abandoned; and I would say the same thing even in regard to those projects which have some merit. They do not all have to be completed at this time. Rome was not built in a day, and neither must every small stream or creek or river be developed in a day. There are appropriate times for things, and I think the appropriate thing at this time is to swing our resources back of this country in its program of preparedness, as I have said, both in a military and naval sense and also in a commercial sense.

Referring to extraordinary expenditures, I want to add to what I said awhile ago that the country is asking us to prepare, and we have already passed a bill, which, I think, has become or will soon become a law through the President's signature, which will raise the military expenditures of this country something like \$150,000,000 or \$200,000,000 annually. We are soon to enter upon the development of our Navy, and I understand the naval appropriation bill will reach a total of something like \$250,000,000 or \$300,000,000. A shipping bill has reached the Senate, calling for something like \$50,000,000. These matters have got to be attended to, because the people as a whole demand that they shall be taken care of; and, of course, the people know that when they make that demand they have got to pay the bills. These things do not come like nitrates from the sky, but have to come about by the expenditure of money from the Treasury. While they know that, and while they are willing to pay the bill for these purposes, even if they increase the expenditures of this Government several hundred millions of dollars annually, I think they do expect, on the other hand, that things which are not of such moment shall either be cut out or deferred or abandoned for the time being.

Our friends on the other side are crowding this Congress for increased preparedness. I know a great many on this side also favor adequate preparedness, and now if that is brought about in accordance with the universal demand or the nonpartisan or bipartisan demand and money is voted for that purpose, it will not lie in the mouths of our Republican friends in the next campaign to charge us with extravagance, because it is not extravagance to put our house in order and to put ourselves in such shape as we ought to put ourselves in to meet exigencies that are now confronting or soon will confront us. And it will not become a Republican to criticize as extravagance something done which they had demanded and costing money for the appropriation of which they are in part responsible. However, even though our friends on the other side are demanding a correction of an evil for which they are responsible in the instance of the river and harbor system—if they call such a thing a system—I feel we ought to feel no resentment, but ought to feel grateful to them for pointing out the evils of their system and for offering to help us cure the evil. I also think we should take in the proper spirit the warning held out to us by them, accompanied as it is with an admission that this and other extravagances on their part while in power in part were responsible for their party's downfall. I hope we will profit by their warnings and their experiences.

Now, in discussing the bill I am not going to go over the old ground that has already been covered, but I have selected three rivers which are to be improved under this bill, and, instead of selecting the worst, I presume everyone will agree that I have selected the best.

You have heard a great deal about some of the rivers and creeks that are to be improved under this bill. Senators have shown the worst projects covered by this bill; they have shown that streams and creeks which carry only a foot and a half of water sometimes are to be improved, and hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars expended upon them. I do not think there is any question about those projects being bad. I think the question was asked a Senator who was discussing one of these creeks where there was little water whether they wanted to supply more water in the creek. It occurred to me that perhaps the reason why a great many of these creeks and rivers are to be improved is because there is too much earth and ground in the bottom of the creeks and rivers, and they want to dig out mother earth itself; they want to turn something from

a purpose to which it is adapted to some purpose to which it is not adapted. We can not change the face of this hemisphere, but we can do certain things to advantage. For instance, in the discussion of the East River project here the other day, which was left out of this bill when it was originally reported to the Senate, it was shown that a certain ridge in the river separated deep basins on either side, and that by the expenditure of a couple of hundred thousand dollars this ridge or bar could be removed, and our dreadnaughts could enter from the sea into the Brooklyn Navy Yard, where during stress of war or battle they might be obliged to go.

That is a project that no two men can disagree upon. It is perfectly obvious that that bar has got to be removed, because it is necessary to have it removed. But that is a far different project from turning a stream having a foot and a half of water into a stream that is navigable for its entire length by means of excavation throughout its entire length, because the more you excavate the lower the water drops. That does not increase your volume of water at all. If you take any given stream with a certain limited supply of water and gouge it out for its entire length, you will have the same result when you finish that you had when you started. You will still have too much ground at the bottom of your river; and you can keep on until you get down to the hot place and it will not do you any good. There is another way, and oftentimes the better or only way, in which water can be put on top of land, and that is by means of dams and reservoirs; but that is another story. What I was going to say is that these creeks a foot and a half in depth their entire length can never be made into rivers that will carry ocean-going steamers. You are just expending your money for the purpose of giving exercise to some men that you like to see exercise. It is merely a little game, that is all—a little play. What I mean to say is that you are paying your money for a useless purpose to keep men out of mischief or to keep them going. That is the effect of it. I do not say that that is the purpose, but that is the effect of it, and it does not get you anywhere.

But that kind of streams I do not care to talk about; but I do want to take what I consider the three most plausible projects we are expending our money on. I think it will be agreed that if the three best that we have do not warrant the expenditures we are making, as we are now making them, then, of course, the worst can not be good enough to spend any money on. I have reference to the Mississippi River, the Missouri River, and the Ohio River.

I have gathered some data here—not through my own industry, but through the industry of others—bearing upon the expenditure of money on these three rivers. I have given some study to the subject and looked over some of the tables, and in a general way know a little about the subject. I hope to know more in the course of years. But, from the showing that is made here, I can not see where we get anything out of even the improvement of these rivers under the present method of expenditure of money. I am going to take up a little of the time of the Senate to discuss these rivers and the money expended on these rivers, and I trust I may be pardoned for reading part of this, because I have not the figures in mind.

Under the present bill we are to expend for these three streams \$15,500,000; and the bill contemplates the expenditure of over \$20,000,000 on 11 streams, or a grand total of over \$40,800,000. I believe the Senate committee has raised it to something like \$43,000,000. I am going to ask to have the table that I have here included in the Record if not already printed in some other speeches. I should like to have it looked at. It shows how this money is to be apportioned. I am going to dwell on the Missouri River first.

That river takes \$1,750,000. Of this, \$1,500,000 is appropriated for 400 miles of river which lie between Kansas City and St. Louis. When the project of the whole river shall have been completed it will have cost the Government the sum of \$34,000,000. Nearly \$20,000,000 has already been expended, and an expenditure of \$14,000,000 is contemplated. Before the era of railroads this river bore a great carrying trade. To-day it has dwindled down to almost nothing; and, as I shall show you shortly, the greater part of the so-called commerce of the Missouri consists of the transportation in barges of the sand and stone and gravel which the Government itself is using in the improvement of this highway of commerce.

Since the opening of the Sixty-fourth Congress two tables showing the plans in favor of reinstating the Missouri River project have been placed in my possession. There is reported, based on the report of 1914, a loss of commerce as follows:

Tons of commerce reported in 1905, 343,435; in 1913, 347,235; in 1914, 240,550. That is a loss of 30 per cent of the commerce on the Missouri River.

After making the deductions of gravel and stone used by the Government itself in these improvements, and the logs and material that could be floated down without any improvement, the actual commerce is as I shall state a little further on. This feature of the commerce, or this distinction between the commerce, I believe, has been discussed here in the Senate; but it seems that these reports are made up with a great deal of duplication, and include commerce carried on by the Government in its execution of the work. Of course it is manifest that when they stop their work this part of the river commerce will cease, and consequently it is not a proper item to be charged up as a part of the general commerce. Therefore it is deducted; and of course on these rivers where logs and lumber can be floated without any improvements, it is clear, it seems to me, that a project should not be credited with a certain amount of commerce that it would have received anyway without the improvements in the river. Of course, too, when a stream can carry logs and timber and things of that kind without any improvement and continues to carry them with the improvement, that part of the commerce is not to be credited to the improvement, but is to be credited to the river in its original state; and therefore it should be deducted.

On the Missouri the actual commerce in 1905 was 18,182; in 1913, 24,000; and in 1914, 19,000, a loss of 30 per cent also for 1914 over 1913.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he means by the commerce on the Missouri River the commerce through the entire extent of what is known as the navigable Missouri River, from Fort Benton to the mouth of the Missouri, near St. Louis, or does he just refer to particular stretches of the river, as from St. Louis to Kansas City and from Kansas City to Sioux City, Iowa?

Mr. HUSTING. I should have to refer to the reports to get that information. I think the Deakye report will show that. I am coming to that in a little while. Perhaps I have that information here. My understanding is that that is the entire river, or so much thereof, at least, as is credited to the part over which the improvement has been made for which this appropriation is asked.

Mr. STERLING. I am not sure whether the figures given by the Senator referred to the tons of commerce or to the value of the commerce.

Mr. HUSTING. Those are the tons of commerce. I want to say to the Senator from South Dakota, or any other Senator present, that I should like to be corrected in case I make mistakes in the figures presented. I have confessed that I am not as well grounded in this matter as I should be; but I am taking this from what I consider reliable reports, and I should like to be corrected if I make any misstatement. To my mind, these figures never have been contradicted or challenged.

Take, for instance, the conditions on the Missouri River in 1913. The report shows—and this will be found in Mr. FREAR's minority report—a table which purports to give the freight traffic on the Missouri River. The total valuation of the commerce is \$3,929,212.32 and a tonnage of about 347,235. Of this, 309,577 tons was sand and gravel hauled 1 mile.

Nine-tenths of the traffic was barged 1 mile; showing that while the figures are somewhat imposing, yet, getting down to brass tacks, there is not very much left in the way of any substantial commerce. Of the above, 309,577 tons consisted of sand and gravel carried 1 mile, probably in the Government's own construction work—a good deal of it, at least. Somebody in the neighborhood of Kansas City hauled 2,513 tons of sand 9 miles, and 10,312 tons of railroad ties were hauled 14 miles. This makes a total of 322,402 tons of these freight items, and the average haul was about 2 miles. The balance consists of a little bit of grain, logs, and wood, chiefly material which could be floated down any unimproved river. The total of this amount is 24,833 tons and the average haul less than 100 miles.

Lieut. Col. Herbert Deakye, of the Corps of Engineers, who was sent to reexamine the Missouri River, reported on April 15 that this project should be abandoned. I am going to take the time of the Senate to read his report in full:

REEXAMINATION OF MISSOURI RIVER FROM KANSAS CITY, MO., TO THE MOUTH.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Kansas City, Mo., April 22, 1915.

From: The District Engineer Officer.

To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army
(Through the Division Engineer).

Subject: Reexamination of project, Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth.

1. In compliance with instructions contained in department letter dated March 18, 1915, I submit the following report giving my general views on the question of the modification or abandonment of the project for the improvement of the Missouri River from Kansas City to the

mouth. This report is called for by section 14 of the river and harbor act approved March 4, 1915.

2. The project for this improvement was adopted by Congress July 25, 1912, in the following language:

"Improving Missouri River with a view to securing a permanent 6-foot channel between Kansas City and the mouth of the river, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1287, Sixty-first Congress, third session, and with a view to the completion of such improvement within a period of 10 years, \$800,000: *Provided*, That cooperation from the localities benefited may be required in the prosecution of the said project in case any comprehensive plan is hereafter adopted by Congress for an apportionment of expense generally applicable to river and other projects in which any improvement now or hereafter adopted confers special or exceptional benefit upon the localities affected: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall postpone the expenditure of the amount hereby appropriated or any further appropriation for said project without action by Congress."

However, the first appropriation for the work was made June 25, 1910, in the following language:

"Improving Missouri River, with a view to securing a permanent 6-foot channel between Kansas City and the mouth of the river, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall appoint a board of three officers to further consider and report upon the most economical and desirable plan of securing such channel, in which report consideration will be given to the subject of cooperation on the part of local interests in the work of said improvement: *Provided further*, That the report hereby authorized shall be submitted to Congress on or before the opening of its next regular session."

3. The appropriations and allotments made for this project are as follows:

June 25, 1910.....	\$1,000,000
Feb. 27, 1911, authorized.....	600,000
Aug. 24, 1912, appropriated.....	800,000
July 25, 1912.....	2,000,000
Mar. 4, 1913.....	\$50,000
Oct. 2, 1914.....	1,000,000
Mar. 4, 1915.....	
Total of 6 appropriations.....	6,250,000

It will be noted that the appropriations have been made at about half the rate mentioned in the act adopting the project.

4. The expenditures to March 4, 1915, were \$3,577,290.85, consisting of \$3,286,082.59 for improvement and \$291,208.26 for maintenance. It is estimated that the project is about 9 per cent completed. There have been large expenditures for plant since the inception of the project, and for that reason and on account of the lack of appropriations at the proper rate, the amount expended and the percentage completed appear out of proportion. But it has been demonstrated that the work can be done within the estimated unit cost, and it is my opinion that with appropriations at the rate of \$2,000,000 per year for improvement and sufficient funds for maintenance the project could be completed within the total estimated cost.

5. The cost of maintenance after completion of the project is estimated at \$500,000 per year. The maintenance work, including snagging, is now costing about \$100,000 per year. It will gradually increase as the work progresses. If appropriations are continued at the rate of about \$1,000,000 per year, and the maintenance increases from \$100,000 to \$500,000 per year, averaging \$300,000 per year during the execution of the work, it is plain that over 20 years from this time will be required to complete the project.

6. I consider that the question of modifying or abandoning the project is one to be decided by a comparison of the cost involved with the benefits derived. Assuming the money of the Government to be worth 3 per cent interest, the total estimated cost of the project represents \$600,000 per year interest. Adding the maintenance cost of \$500,000 per year gives \$1,100,000 per year as the permanent charge to the Government resulting from the execution and maintenance of this project.

7. The benefits derived are represented by the increased facilities for navigation. There are other incidental benefits, such as the protection of lands from erosion and the amelioration of flood conditions, but these have not been recognized as proper objects of Government expenditure on the Missouri River and are therefore not considered in the analysis.

8. The commerce to be considered is present and prospective, and the advantages that commerce will obtain from the improvement are the actual saving in freight charges by the use of the river and the effect on railroad freight rates produced by the possibility of water transportation.

The commerce for the calendar year 1914 is not fully tabulated.

Then follows the total I have just read. I want to say that is in Deakye's report, and that is my authority for the statement.

Mr. STERLING. I ask the Senator if he can refer again without much trouble to the figures he gave of the tonnage on the Missouri River from Kansas City to the mouth?

Mr. HUSTING. This is the total, but I think that is filed with the Deakye report. I will give you the figures found in his report and that is my authority for these distances concerning which he proposes to cover. He does not say what part of the stream it is in, but I assume it is for that part affected by this money, whether the whole or a part of it.

Mr. STERLING. I refer to the figures given by the Senator.

Mr. HUSTING. This is the same table.

Mr. STERLING. May I call the attention of the Senator for the purpose of the Record to the statement given in the report of the Committee on Commerce? As I remember the figures given earlier in the Senator's address, he gave the tonnage as something like 18,000 or 19,000 tons.

Mr. HUSTING. No; the total tonnage was 347,235.

Mr. STERLING. For 1913?

Mr. HUSTING. For 1913; and I deducted from that the gravel. I am coming to that now, and I will give them over again if you desire.

Mr. STERLING. I do not care to have the Senator repeat it, but I call the Senator's attention also to the value of that tonnage during the three years 1912, 1913, and 1914, showing a constantly increasing value of the tonnage during those three years.

Mr. HUSTING. Please give me the page of the report.

Mr. STERLING. Page 365 of the report. I suppose that is taken from the report of the Board of Army Engineers.

Mr. HUSTING. These figures are taken from the Deakyne report and I assume that they are correct. I say personally I do not know whether they are or not.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUSTING. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I ask the Senator if he does not know that that report was absolutely turned down by a full board, who sat on it and repudiated it—

Mr. HUSTING. What board?

Mr. REED. The board of appeal that was appointed, at the head of which was Col. Black, now Gen. Black; and that after a full hearing this report was not only repudiated, but after the hearing placed Deakyne in a position that I will not say was discreditable but, at least, it was extremely pitiable.

Mr. HUSTING. I am sorry if I shall be quoting anybody who has been discredited by any subsequent investigation, but I do not understand from the Senator that his figures were challenged.

Mr. REED. There were many other figures given, and the fact that his figures were inapplicable and unjust was made clearly manifest.

Mr. HUSTING. That is a matter of argument.

Mr. REED. No; it is not a matter of argument, because the board of appeal found against him, consisting, I think, of nine officers who came there and had a hearing lasting for several days. At the head of that board was then Col. Black, who is now Gen. Black, Chief of Engineers. The fullest hearing was had, and I say without desiring to reflect upon Col. Deakyne that I never saw a man in a much more pitiable condition than he was after that hearing had proceeded a few days.

The fact is Col. Deakyne did not understand the Missouri River or know what he was trying to do. It had been a pretty complete failure all the time he was out there; and his report is discredited and discarded and in the waste basket of forgetfulness, except that the Senator has reached down and shaken the dust off of it and brought it in here before the Senate.

Mr. HUSTING. I will say to the Senator that I do not understand whether the Senator is stating these things as his opinion or whether he is stating his opinion as to the pitiable condition of the engineer at the time he appeared before the board. I will state to the Senator that I shall take occasion to look up this conference of these governors or the report of this committee and see whether they have denounced him as severely as the Senator has done.

Mr. REED. They did not denounce him. They simply reported against everything that he reported in favor of, that is all.

Mr. HUSTING. I would consider that as a matter not in any way reflecting on the figures and facts given by the engineer.

Mr. REED. I have already said there were at this hearing facts and figures produced which showed that the figures of Col. Deakyne were inadequate, were not complete, and that new facts and new figures and new evidence throw added light on the whole proposition and entirely destroy the effect of these figures. The Senator will be so kind as to permit me to observe at this point one trouble with Col. Deakyne's figures, and it goes to the Senator's argument. I do not know whether the Senator has ever seen the Missouri River or not.

Mr. HUSTING. Yes; I have seen it.

Mr. REED. I suppose he has seen it. That is probably about all.

Mr. HUSTING. I have not seen it as often as the Senator has.

Mr. REED. No. One trouble is that Col. Deakyne's figures were based upon tonnage upon a river which everybody admits until it is improved is only navigable at certain periods of the year and by boats of certain special build and limited capacity. The effect of the Senator's argument is and the effect of Col. Deakyne's report was that it was a fair test of the value of the river. In other words, a river is unnavigable because of certain bars across it. Therefore these gentlemen say, not being navigated to any great extent, it is unfit for navigation,

and they proceed to prove that by the fact that there is no navigation, and that navigation is practically impossible, when the proposition is to cut through those obstructions and to place the river in a condition to be navigated.

Mr. HUSTING. How many miles, I should like to know, have to be excavated and how much money has to be expended before the improvement of the Mississippi River can be made.

Mr. REED. The amount that is estimated for the completed project is \$20,000,000.

Mr. HUSTING. And \$14,000,000 more.

Mr. REED. No; about \$14,000,000 to cover the entire river.

Mr. HUSTING. For 400 miles.

Mr. REED. From Kansas City to St. Louis, a distance of about 420 miles, I think, though I have not the figures in my mind. Now, I want to get—

Mr. HUSTING. Before the Senator leaves that, as I understand it his reflection on this engineer is that his idea of what is going to happen after the river is improved differs from the opinion of the corps of engineers who examined it.

Mr. REED. No; the point I am making now is that no man with good judgment and with a reasonable degree of fairness wants to attack a thing simply for the sake of attacking it.

Mr. HUSTING. I should like to ask the Senator a question in order to get this position clearly before the Senate, if he will. The point, then, is that the figures are not disputed, but that the appropriation rests on the future commerce and the possibilities of future commerce, and not on what has already been engaged.

Mr. REED. There are some of the figures that the engineer gave that are accurate. Many of them, however, are not complete.

Mr. HUSTING. Will the Senator point out those not complete.

Mr. REED. I will at the proper time. I could not do it out of mind. I have not the report before me. I can bring the figures here, however. This is what I want to get into the Senator's mind, and I am presenting it to him as a fair man. Assume the case of a good highway built up to a river bank and a good highway upon the other side of the river, an impassable river, and no bridge. Now, it is proposed to appropriate some money to build a bridge, and the report is there has never been any traffic across that river, and therefore, because there has never been any traffic across the river, except perhaps by some ford that could only be used one month in a year, the bridge should not be built. Now, that has been the line of reasoning followed by every man who has opposed this project.

Mr. HUSTING. That will not be the line I am going to follow.

Mr. REED. That was Deakyne's plan. He said, "Here is a river. How much business have you upon this river now?" In the face of the fact that he knew and that everybody else knew who knew anything about it that the reason why the traffic was not on the river was because in moving their boats up and down at every season of the year except in high water there were certain shallows and certain bars that made it impossible to move their boats. The project is to remove those obstructions. Therefore the question is not how much there has been but how much there will be in traffic upon that stream.

Now, that is to be settled. It is upon the basis that the river has been made navigable, which all engineers, five or six boards sitting at different times, have agreed is entirely feasible and practical. The further question is, Is there business? Is there traffic along this river which at prices that it can be hauled for will go to the river?

The answer to that is that there is no territory west of the Mississippi River that will afford an equal amount of traffic. That is shown by population, shown by the great wealth and resources of the country, by the enormous production, by the thick population, and by the fact that the boat line already operating under these almost impossible conditions has been able to operate and pay its expenses with a cut in freight rates on the average of 20 per cent. Now, if you—

Mr. HUSTING. If the Senator please, I should like to resume my argument.

Mr. REED. Let me just finish this sentence. When you remove the obstructions so that the river can be fully employed, the evidence that was taken before the board of appeals overwhelmingly shows that the river would carry upon its bosom an enormous commerce which would result in a reduction of freight rates to all of that great State and to the territory that is tributary to it, the Dakotas, and even Oklahoma, and that the resultant benefit to the public would be almost incalculable. Yet in face of that showing we are asked to consider Mr. Deakyne's report based upon the unimproved condition of the river. I am obliged to the Senator.

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator talks of the future. It is impossible to show the future. I do not care what any corps of engineers may venture to predict as to what is going to happen in the future, the future can be better judged from the past than it can by the prognostications of a board of engineers. I believe—I have been so informed, and I feel that I am fairly safe in making the statement—that the figures all go to show that river transportation has decreased over those parts of rivers that have been improved, or, in other words, that it has decreased whether it has been improved or not.

Mr. REED. On the Missouri River?

Mr. HUSTING. Yes. I will take it not for a couple of years, but take it ever since the river has been improved, and there has been a decrease in proportion to the total transportation, if not a literal decrease in transportation, in the amount of transportation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SIMMONS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUSTING. For a question.

Mr. REED. The Senator certainly wants to get his figures right.

Mr. HUSTING. Yes.

Mr. REED. There was a time many years ago when there were no railroads and when the traffic there had to be upon the river, when there was a very considerable tonnage upon the Missouri River and upon many little rivers that we would not consider navigable.

Mr. HUSTING. I have already shown by this table that the tonnage on the Missouri River has decreased from 343,435 tons in 1905 to 240,550 tons in 1912, the total commerce. It is true that before the advent of the railroad west of the Mississippi the river tonnage was high, but it has steadily been declining ever since, at least proportionately if not literally.

Mr. REED. There are no such figures, in fact.

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator—

Mr. REED. I want to get the Senator right. My word on this is almost as good and important as an Army engineer's. They are not infallible. I say to the Senator that the figures absolutely show that since the present boat line was put on—now some four or five years back—there has been a steady, constant, and rapid increase in traffic upon that river; and anybody who says to the contrary—I do not care whether he is an Army engineer or whether he is a Hottentot—is not stating what is the fact.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to say, in all fairness, I think the Senator from Wisconsin ought to include in his table the value of this commerce, as it has increased in the last three years. It runs thus—that is, between Kansas City and the mouth of the Missouri: In 1912 it was \$3,149,870.

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator is now speaking of the value of the commerce.

Mr. STERLING. Of the value. Just let me complete this statement. In 1913 it was \$3,929,212, and in 1914, \$4,677,297, making a total for those three years on that stretch of the Missouri River of \$11,756,289.

Now, the Senator from Wisconsin does not consider that as inconsiderable commerce; but if there was that commerce with the then condition of the river and it can be increased by the improvement of the river, would not the Senator be in favor of making the improvement?

Mr. HUSTING. I will ask the Senator whether he is giving the value of the cargo. I should like to have the Senator give, if he can, the tonnage.

Mr. STERLING. I can give the Senator the tonnage.

Mr. HUSTING. It may be different from the figures I gave.

Mr. STERLING. The tonnage in 1912 was 185,110; in 1913, 347,235; and in 1914 the tonnage was as the Senator stated—240,550—but now the value of that tonnage has exceeded the value of the tonnage in either of the other years by considerably over a million dollars.

Mr. HUSTING. I do not see that the value of the cargo throws any light on this question at all. It does not as far as I am concerned, or as far as my understanding of the problem is concerned.

Mr. STERLING. It seems to me that the important element in it is the value of the commerce.

Mr. HUSTING. Not of the commerce carried to show the saving in the carrying of that commerce.

Mr. STERLING. Now—

Mr. HUSTING. Just a moment. If you transport commerce in gold coin of the value of \$1,000,000,000 down a river and get \$500 worth of revenue out of it for the carrying of it, and the Government spends \$10,000,000 to transport that billion dollars

of gold down the river 5 miles, I do not see that that is a help to the transportation problem.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HUSTING. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. In the figures suggested by the Senator from South Dakota, if he will analyze them he will find, for instance, 211,000 tons worth of sand and gravel barged a mile and sand and gravel again barged for 9 miles.

Mr. STERLING. I will ask the Senator from Iowa for what year was there tonnage of that kind?

Mr. KENYON. In the report of 1915.

Mr. STERLING. In the report for 1915?

Mr. KENYON. No; the year 1914.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator state the total tonnage and the value of the total tonnage for 1915?

Mr. KENYON. I have it not for 1915. I have it for 1914. It is in the 1915 report. I have it also for 1913. There were 309,000 tons of sand and gravel barged 1 mile.

Mr. HUSTING. I will say to the Senator that Engineer Deakye analyzed those figures. I may as well here ask what are we spending money for in the way of improving water transportation? Is it for the purpose of hauling down the stream goods of great money value, or is it for the purpose of serving the people and saving them money on transportation?

That brings me to the proposition of the Senator from South Dakota. I say it does not make any difference what the value of the cargo is that goes down the river as between a railroad and the waterway. It seems to me that the figures throwing light on the amount of revenue derived by the transportation companies and the amount of tariff or toll that the public has to pay and the difference or the saving between those two either directly or indirectly by reason of the river improvement is the test whether we are spending our money for a useful purpose or not. In other words, taking the question of convenience into consideration, would we, as a business proposition, vote \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000, with \$14,000,000 more, or a total of \$34,000,000, to carry, as the Senator admits his own figures show, a few hundred thousand tons of commerce, where we know that the public will save only about \$10,000 per annum?

Mr. STERLING rose.

Mr. HUSTING. Just pardon me a moment. The Senator from South Dakota gave some figures here as to the tonnage, which entirely coincide with the figures that I have given. So these figures are not challenged; they are corroborated by the report of the committee.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion right there?

Mr. HUSTING. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator speaks of an expenditure of \$20,000,000 on the Missouri River. Now, may I ask to what reach or stretch of the river he has reference?

Mr. HUSTING. I refer to the portion of the river through which this tonnage is carried.

Mr. STERLING. Does the Senator mean, now, from Kansas City to the mouth of the river?

Mr. HUSTING. I refer to any tonnage that goes on the river.

Mr. STERLING. Does the Senator mean the whole river?

Mr. HUSTING. I mean that part of the river on which this \$34,000,000 was expended, or an expenditure which has been made on this particular stretch of the river. If I am wrong, I should like to be corrected.

What is the standard here? What is the compass with which we are going to steer this business? Is it by a view of the good the expenditure does the people and the amount it saves them on transportation charges, or is it going to be without any regard to return for the money expended? Is it merely going to be just for no particular purpose, except to spend the money in certain States because Senators or Representatives want it spent there?

Take the Missouri River. I say it is one of the best, and I have singled it out, and I want to tell the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who was not here at the time that I singled it out, that I am singling this out as one of the three most promising enterprises of the lot—not as the worst, but as one of the best. The worst have been pointed out by the Senators who have spoken before me; but the purpose of my argument, in so far as I can make it clear, is to show that even as the best, taking the best project into consideration, under the present system—

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HUSTING. Just a moment. We are expending our money uselessly and extravagantly without getting just returns for the expenditure.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Wisconsin will have to revise his figures in regard to the amount expended on the Missouri River from Kansas City to the mouth. I have here a statement under the head of "Financial summary" of the amount expended on all projects to June 30, 1915, which shows the expenditure to have been \$10,475,618.90. I understood the Senator to say that \$34,000,000 had been expended for that purpose.

Mr. HUSTING. No; I said \$20,000,000 and \$14,000,000 more—

Mr. STERLING. Then it seems to have been just about half the amount which the Senator stated.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator is talking manifestly with perfect fairness; that is, he intends to be fair—

Mr. HUSTING. I intend to be fair.

Mr. REED. But I suggest to him that, if he thinks there has been any such sum of money as that expended on the stretch of the Missouri River from Kansas City to St. Louis, he had better discontinue his speech, and get somewhere within eight or ten million dollars of the facts.

Mr. HUSTING. I will let the Senator from Missouri get close to the facts. I am stating my authority. I have already made the statement that I have no personal knowledge of this matter, but I am taking my figures from reports that purport to be true. I shall be glad to be corrected by any Senator who finds anything to the contrary.

Here in this summary I find, on looking at it, that the appropriation for the general improvement has been \$15,451,432, and from the mouth of the river to Kansas City it is \$2,250,000, making a total of nearly \$18,000,000. What part of that has been expended I will let the Senator explain, and I hope he will; but, taking the statement that \$10,000,000 have been expended as true, the same argument obtains, and with \$14,000,000 more of expenditure it makes a total of \$24,000,000. If my figures are not correct, let us take the Senator's own figures.

Mr. REED. I did not give those figures. I said that the Senator was off over \$10,000,000. Now, he has got it up to \$24,000,000 as the amount which will be ultimately expended.

Mr. HUSTING. There is \$14,000,000 more to be expended. The Senator himself said that a little while ago.

Mr. REED. I said approximately, but I did not say \$10,000,000 had been expended. The total that was contemplated to be appropriated was \$20,000,000. So the Senator will have to cut off 4,000,000 more cats to get down to the number that are in the back yard.

Mr. HUSTING. I said that if there were only ten millions appropriated, the same argument will hold good, and the Senator admits that the amount will be \$21,000,000.

Mr. REED. No; I admitted it to be \$20,000,000.

Mr. HUSTING. Well, the Senator admits it to be \$20,000,000. I will not haggle with him about millions; five or six million dollars, more or less, in a matter like this, according to past practices, does not change the proposition in the least. Let us say that \$20,000,000 will be expended on this proposition.

I say the test is whether we are warranted in expending that \$20,000,000 when we could take every ounce of commerce that has been floated down there, pay the expense of transportation on the railroads, and have almost our \$20,000,000 left in the Treasury.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, as I understand, the commerce for three years—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HUSTING. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. The commerce for the three years 1912, 1913, and 1914 amounts to more than has been expended up to this date.

Mr. HUSTING. But the Senator from South Dakota misunderstands me. I did not mean to pay for the cargoes. I meant to pay for the transportation charges on those cargoes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUSTING. Certainly; for a question.

Mr. REED. If the result of the river transportation has been to reduce railroad rates generally to all that vast territory, would the Senator from Wisconsin regard that as a fact that might be considered?

Mr. HUSTING. That is a fact that certainly should be taken into consideration as a factor in the question; but I am coming to that a little later. I am now talking about the saving in the transportation charges.

Let us take these figures. I again want to say that I do not propose that the United States shall buy the cargo and pay the \$10,000,000 for the cargo itself; but I am speaking as to the saving in the transportation charges on this cargo. This cargo, as I understand, in 1914 amounted to 240,550 tons. I do not understand that that part of it was carried a considerable distance. The total tonnage carried between these points amounted in 1913 to 347,235 tons.

Of that gravel, logs, and lumber rafted amounted to 309,684 tons, which leaves a difference of 37,551 tons of genuine commerce; that is, commerce in the sense that it would be transported regardless of whether or not this improvement was going on.

I do not know just what transportation per ton might be worth. Let us say that it is worth \$5 a ton, which is a pretty fair charge, I think, for 50 cents a hundred is a pretty fair charge.

Mr. REED. Fifty cents a hundred would be \$10 a ton.

Mr. HUSTING. Very true; 50 cents a hundred would be \$10 a ton. Let us say \$10 a ton. You would have for this 37,551 tons \$370,000 for the total freight charges of that commerce. Now, let us say you save 20 per cent by sending it by water. That would make \$60,000 saving to the people in the carrying of that cargo; but you are going to pay out when it is all done a total expenditure of \$20,000,000. The interest on that at 3 per cent represents an annual interest charge of \$600,000. Add a maintenance cost of \$100,000 or \$200,000 or \$300,000 a year, and you are paying practically a million dollars per year to save somebody \$60,000 in freight charges. Those are merely arbitrary figures. You can double them or you can divide them or you can multiply them by three or four, and the showing will be the same, except in the matter of degree. Does it pay to do that? That is the question. Is there not some other way, some better way, to arrive at this thing and make it pay?

I want to say that I am not in favor of permanently abandoning the waterways of this country. I favor a complete and harmonious development of the Mississippi River watershed from the Great Lakes down to the Gulf. What I am complaining of is that we are proceeding in a way that is wasteful and extravagant and does not get us anywhere.

Proceeding with the reading of this report—and I want to say in behalf of Col. Deakne that, without a further showing at least, I do not subscribe ipso facto to the declarations made by the other board; in fact, it has been one of the peculiar things in all this river and harbor appropriation business that inquiries are made by Congress; an engineer is sent to the ground to look it over; he comes back and makes a good, honest report, and after he has made a report that is adverse, and that turns down the project, the engineer is browbeaten; he is coerced; and he is discredited because he has dared to go in and independently to tell the truth and make a fair and honest report.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HUSTING. I am going to presume that this man made an honest report until I hear some facts which convince me to the contrary.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUSTING. Yes; for a question.

Mr. REED. What reason has the Senator to think that Col. Deakne is any more honest than the board of eight or nine men who were sent there to examine this project?

Mr. HUSTING. I do not say he is any more honest. I say he is as honest, presumptively.

Mr. REED. But the Senator complains that an engineer goes out and makes an honest report, and then is turned down by some board, the intimation being that the men composing the board were dishonest, and he was honest.

Mr. HUSTING. I do not know anything about that. I will say, in reply to the Senator, that here is a man who goes and gets the facts; he is on the ground, and presumably he knows the facts; but when he gets back here his findings are overturned by others who are not acquainted with the facts and who in fact invested him with the authority to go and get them.

Mr. REED. Why, Mr. President—

Mr. HUSTING. The presumption in my mind is in favor of this engineer's report, unless some presumption is raised against his honesty and integrity; and when the Senator sees fit to impugn bad motives to the colonel, I am going in my humble way, at least for the present, to state why I think the colonel is all right.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the trouble with the Senator is, that when a report is made by an officer condemning a project that appeals to the Senator's mind that man immediately is honest; but when anybody reports the other way, that being in

opposition to the Senator's own preconceived notions, he regards the other man as dishonest. Now—

Mr. HUSTING. Wait a moment.

Mr. REED. I did not reflect upon Col. Deakne's honesty; I simply said he had made a report that was literally torn to pieces upon a full hearing. Now, I say to the Senator—

Mr. HUSTING. Who tore it to pieces, I should like to ask the Senator?

Mr. REED. It was torn to pieces by the testimony of witnesses, by an elaborate statement of facts by witnesses who testified that they were on the ground and knew all about the conditions. Now, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the board of appeal did not sit here in Washington; the board of appeal went out on the river and examined the project, and it had upon it men who were familiar with river improvement in the country and who were familiar with the history of the Missouri River improvement. Therefore it was not any star-chamber examination by men who had never been on the ground.

Mr. HUSTING. Was Col. Townsend one of these men?

Mr. REED. I think not; I do not recall his name. I am not good at remembering names.

Mr. HUSTING. Has the Senator finished?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator says that Col. Deakne's report was all torn to pieces. I should like to have the Senator, if he will be kind enough, to call my attention to the place where these facts were challenged or produce figures with which to disprove these facts. Opinions and insinuations merely that this man is not all right do not dispute the facts.

Here are the facts which the colonel has given, and he has given his reasons. I think his reasons are good; I think they are sound; I think his whole analysis of the question is sound; and if anybody has any fault to find with the Deakne report, it would seem that either his reasoning or his facts or something else of material interest and value to this discussion should be disproven.

Of course, this Deakne report, discrediting in a way, or at least advocating the abandonment of this project, certainly, standing for its face value, is an indictment against the project; and, of course, if this report and its author can be discredited, it certainly relieves the situation quite a bit, so far as that project is concerned.

I do not want to stand here and defend Col. Deakne if he is indefensible, but I should like to know whether the facts are wrong or whether his reasoning is wrong or whether his premises are wrong. Now—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HUSTING. If they are, I should like to have the Senator, not during my time, but I should like him to be kind enough during his own time to put them in the RECORD, so that it will disprove this without going into a discussion of it. The facts, if they are facts, will show that it is all wrong if that is really the case.

Mr. REED. I want to put them in now—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REED. Because the Senator ought to get right. I think the Senator can be convinced, although, perhaps, not here in public.

Mr. HUSTING. I would be willing to take it up with the Senator at some other time.

Mr. REED. Of course, the Senator would hardly get up and read to the Senate the findings of fact and conclusions of law of a nisi prius court if he knew that that decision, upon an appeal, had been completely reversed. He would regard the decision on appeal, and not the nisi prius decision, as the authority.

Mr. HUSTING. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. REED. Now—

Mr. HUSTING. Wait just a moment. I should like to have the privilege of asking the Senator a question on my time.

Mr. REED. I wanted to make my statement of fact; that was all.

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator does not dispute the amount of tonnage that has been carried on the river in these years, does he?

Mr. REED. I have already said that it was inaccurate in that it did not include a great many items that ought to have been included, and that it was not brought down to date.

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STENLING] shows that it agrees with the tonnage reported by the committee, so that Col. Deakne's report is verified by the figures given by the committee. The Senator also admits, as I understand, that at least \$21,000,000 is to be devoted to this project.

Mr. REED. No; the Senator still is bound to swell it one million.

Mr. HUSTING. I beg the Senator's pardon; I mean twenty million.

Mr. REED. Yes. The Senator never makes any mistakes the other way. Go ahead, however.

Mr. HUSTING. Well, I do not think the Senator from Missouri will make a mistake the other way on his figures. The question that is vital, to my mind, here is whether we are warranted in expending \$20,000,000 to carry about 37,551 tons of commerce annually.

Mr. REED. The Senator addresses that inquiry to me. I have already pointed out to the Senator that this river, with these bars and obstructions in it, can only be navigated under great difficulty, and at certain seasons of the year not at all, but that every engineer who has ever reported upon the project has said that it is absolutely feasible to remove these bars and obstructions. The question, then, is not How much have you carried over impassable obstructions? but How much can you carry with the obstructions removed? The Senator refuses absolutely to bring his mind to the consideration of that question.

Mr. HUSTING. If the Senator will not interrupt me any further, I will try to bring my mind to that question.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator let me conclude? A while ago I asked the Senator, who stands here reading the report of Col. Deakne, if he would think of reading to the Senate as an authority the finding of fact and conclusion of law of a nisi prius court when he knew that that finding of fact and all the conclusions of law had been overturned by the appellate court. I now want to say to him that Col. Deakne made this report. The law provides for a board of appeals which consists, I think, of nine—I am not sure, although I sat for days before the board—of from seven to nine Army engineers. At the head of that board was Col. Black, who is now the Chief of Engineers of the Army.

Mr. HUSTING. When did that board sit?

Mr. REED. It sat here last fall—last December. And I read to the Senator the concluding paragraph of that report.

Mr. HUSTING. By whom was it signed?

Mr. REED. It is signed by William M. Black, senior member of the board, for the board, of course.

A review of the entire situation indicates that the present grounds for continuance of this project are stronger than those which led to its adoption. The board therefore concludes that it is advisable for the United States to continue the improvement of the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth in accordance with the existing project.

I have only read the concluding paragraph; but there is nothing in the whole report reflecting upon Col. Deakne. Nobody is charging him with bad faith, but there is a complete turn-down of his entire conclusion. Now, I ask the Senator, knowing that fact, knowing that this report is turned down by a board duly constituted for that purpose, turned down unanimously, if he thinks he ought to stand here before the Senate and read Col. Deakne's report as the correct finding of fact?

Mr. HUSTING. I presume we are here for the purpose of considering the facts. If the board's report forecloses the Senate from going into the question, then the discussion might as well end right here; but I for one understand that that is merely advisory to the Senate, the same as Col. Deakne's report is advisory to the Senate; and I for one reserve to myself the right of seeing whose judgment and whose reasoning is the best, so that I may form my own opinion on the subject and so that I may vote intelligently on the subject.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, has the Senator read the report of this board of review?

Mr. HUSTING. No; but I have given the facts here.

Mr. REED. If the Senator has not read the report of the board of review, and, in fact, did not know such a report had ever been made until I told him so a few moments ago, and says that he reserves to himself the right to examine the facts, I want to ask if he does not think he had better read that report before he assumes as a fact things that have already been condemned?

Mr. HUSTING. Why, Mr. President, the Senator says "things have been condemned." I do not understand that any things have been condemned. It is a matter of judgment between the board and the colonel on facts that are not disputed.

Mr. REED. The facts are in dispute.

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator makes the statement that because the report differs from Col. Deakne, therefore his findings of fact are challenged and discredited. Why, of course I know that Col. Deakne's report was overturned; otherwise we would not be here discussing this item. It would not be in the bill. I know it was overturned, but I want to know why

it was overturned and whether or not they were warranted in overturning it.

Mr. REED. Then why does not the Senator read the "whys" that are set forth in this report before he undertakes to enlighten the Senate about something he has never seen? If he wants to know the "whys," why does he not go and look at them?

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator has outlined what they have found—that they think they are going to have a great deal of commerce in the future. I have the facts here, which I do not think the Senator will dispute; that instead of the board being warranted in the belief that the transportation is going to be increased in the future all the facts of the past negative that presumption, and that as a matter of fact the probabilities are that the transportation will decrease instead of increase. So, I say it is not a question of whose report is right; and I am not citing the Deakyne report as to what he thinks, but I am merely citing it because of the facts that he adduces here, and which throw light on this question. I say again that the questions recur whether we want to spend \$20,000,000 to preserve a commerce of 37,000 tons annually. That is the question, and it is from that point of view that I am going to argue this matter or try to argue it, at least.

Now, I will go ahead with the reading of the Deakyne report.

A table is given here for 1913 which shows the grain and the hay and the feed and the flour and the oil, and so forth, amounting in all to 347,235 tons.

The items that are not benefited by improvement of the river are the sand and gravel barged and the logs and lumber rafted.

Now, why is that? That is because they do not have to improve a river to float down barges or logs and lumber. The river is good enough for that without improvement. So if you are going to put \$20,000,000 into that river, you have got to show that they are going to haul something besides that which they can already float down the river without spending the \$20,000,000.

Eliminating the logs and the sand and gravel barged, the remaining traffic is 37,551 tons, divided into classes which are carried over average distances of from 8 to 291 miles. The total freight charge on this traffic was about \$41,000. The Kansas City-Missouri River Navigation Co., the only through line on the river, operating between Kansas City and St. Louis, charges 80 per cent of the railroad freight rates. Assuming this to be the relation between the rail and water rates for the entire traffic, the saving to shippers by the use of the river in 1913 was about \$10,000.

The interesting question is, Are those figures correct? That is to say, that the shippers were saved \$10,000 by the expenditure of something like \$10,000,000, and in which we are asked to invest another \$10,000,000, or \$20,000,000 in all. In other words, is it a good business proposition to expend \$20,000,000 to save \$10,000 annually?

It is evident that this saving is entirely inadequate to warrant the serious consideration of an expenditure by the Government of \$1,100,000 per year in interest and maintenance.

The colonel here, with all the disgrace that he is said to have suffered by the adverse report of the Board of Engineers covering his recommendations, not the facts, is a mathematician, at least. He figures out, by what we have already spent—that is, the interest on the money that we have already spent and the maintenance charges, that it will cost the Government to maintain this project \$1,100,000 a year. Now, the Colonel wants to know whether we want to spend \$1,100,000 a year in perpetuity to save somebody \$10,000 annually.

With all due regard for the board that turned down Col. Deakyne, I should like to have them explain why they think it is wise for the Government to spend \$1,100,000 a year to save \$10,000. I should like to have them explain why it would not be better to give a bounty of \$10,000 to these shippers and pay the difference in the freight rates for them and save \$1,990,000 a year. I say, with all due respect for them, that I stand for the colonel as against the board.

I think his reasoning is a great deal better than the board's reasoning, and if the facts are correct, I should like to have the Senator from Missouri give his opinion as to what he thinks about that as a business proposition.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. HUSTING. I do not mean at this time, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUSTING. Yes.

Mr. REED. I have already tried to make plain to the Senator that a man can not test his ability to cook victuals until he has fuel to put in his stove; that you can not test the ability

to carry traffic upon a stream by what is carried when you have no channel through which a boat can run; and that any man who uses the amount of traffic which is carried on a nonnavigable stream to test what will be carried upon that stream when it is made navigable is not proceeding in accordance with ordinary common sense and reason.

I want to say to the Senator further that he is in that class of individuals to which the old lady belonged who said to her daughter, when she asked: "Mother, may I go out to swim?" "Yes, my darling daughter; hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't go near the water." The girl was expected to swim without going into the water. The Senator expects transportation upon a stream that the Government admits and everybody admits has bars and shallows in it that prohibit successful transportation; and then, under those conditions, he stands and lustily shouts, "Why don't you show us that you have carried enough traffic to pay the interest on the investment?"

You might just as well say to a man who had not yet built his house, "Show us the rents you have received from your house." The wise man would say, "How much rent will I get when the house is built?" not "How much have I received before it is built?"

Mr. HUSTING. Let me ask the Senator whether he does not think a wise man would find out what other people were getting for like houses in the way of rent?

Mr. REED. Yes; and you would find out how many people there were in a community, and what the rents were, and then you would estimate. So this board has found out here what the population is; that at one end of this stretch of the river is a city of 750,000 people; and that at the other end of the stretch are nearly 500,000 people.

Mr. HUSTING. Just a moment. Does the Senator know of any river that has been improved that would warrant him in believing that this \$10,000 in saving is going to be stretched into anything near—

Mr. REED. Now the Senator talks about \$10,000 in saving. Indeed, I think it is pretty nearly useless for the Senator and me to debate.

Mr. HUSTING. Then I hope the Senator will let me proceed.

Mr. REED. When the Senator admits, as he has admitted, that if the lowering of the rates upon the river resulted in a general lowering of freight rates, that fact ought to be considered, and then utterly ignores the fact that the river traffic has kept down railroad rates, and proceeds to talk about \$10,000 saving—

Mr. HUSTING. I want to say to the Senator that he does not give me an opportunity to get to that. I will try to get to it a little later.

Mr. REED (continuing). It looks to me as though he was more interested in attacking the project than in ascertaining the facts.

Mr. HUSTING. The Senator does me an injustice. I want to say that this is the trouble with the Senator's position about this young lady who wanted to go out and swim: The mother in his case would say, "No; my darling daughter; we have no river around here, but I will go and dig one for you, and then, after we get it dug, I will let you go in and swim."

Mr. REED. No; what she would say, if she had any sense, would be: "If you want to learn to swim, go down to the river and learn to swim."

Mr. HUSTING. Well, she would say: "It is not deep enough, my daughter, so I will go and dig a few million dollars' worth of ground out of it."

Mr. REED. That would be a good thing if there was great necessity for a bath.

Mr. HUSTING. To be sure; and if that was the only place to bathe it would be all right to go and dig a hole for the young lady to go in swimming. But here the Senator wants to ignore all the lakes and the oceans we have around here, and go and dig some rivers purely for the purpose of giving some young lady an opportunity to take a swim. I will ask him whether, in that case, he would want to expend \$1,100,000 a year in order to give the ladies of the country \$10,000 worth of bathing.

That is the way I look at this situation. I say that it is a business proposition, that it is a matter of public policy, and I again say that I stand for Col. Deakyne as against the board in his saying that he does not believe in a project on which in order to save somebody \$10,000 they want to spend \$1,100,000 a year.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator let me enlighten him on the situation with reference to the difficulties of navigation and the absolute unfairness of testing this matter by the present navigation?

Mr. HUSTING. Yes; although I should like to proceed.

Mr. REED. Here is a report. There are between Kansas City and St. Louis some 11 shallows. The report of the Kansas City (Mo.) Navigation Co.—which was put in at this hearing, and which was very accurately kept—shows that on one bar, the Baltimore bar, their boats were obstructed 85 times in the season of 1914-15; the Glasgow bar, 154 times; the Saline City bar, 165 times; the Plow Boy bar, 210 times; the Stanley Island bar, 230 times; the Isbell bar, 258 times; the Chamois bar, 266 times; the Klondyke bar, 334 times; the St. Albans bar, 337 times; the St. Charles bar, 363 times; the Pelican Island bar, 377 times.

Those were the obstructions that these boats suffered. Nevertheless, in the face of all that, they practically managed to pay expenses, with a cut in freight rates of 20 per cent. On the other stretches of the river, with these bars out, these boats could ply up and down there carrying any amount of commerce. What this bill proposes to do is to cut out these bars and shallows and to remove these obstructions.

In view of the figures I have given, does the Senator think that the navigation, in the face of these obstructions, is a fair test of what can be done with the obstructions removed? I should like to have the Senator answer that question fairly. Does he think it is a fair test?

Mr. HUSTING. I do not quite understand the Senator's question as to what is a fair test.

Mr. REED. I could not make it plainer.

Mr. HUSTING. I ought to say that one illustration does not make a fact any more than one swallow makes a summer. This thing has got to be looked upon in its entirety.

I have already said that I can conceive that in the East River of New York, where there is an obstruction and a bar surrounded by water on both sides, the removal of the bar will make the entire river navigable. A hill now and then will warrant that it ought to be removed, and the railroad considers it good business policy to remove it and even up their grade, but they could not shovel away the whole Rocky Mountains any more than you can excavate the bottom of the whole river and make it something that nature did not intend it to be. It is not to be done by digging out the bottom. You can put water on top of it and increase your depth of water in an intelligent way, but when that river is only a 2-foot river you can not make it a 10-foot river. No matter how much you dig, when you dig all along the bed the water settles down in its bed, and you have still only 2 feet; you have a big ditch, but you have not any more water in it. So a project to be a feasible project, and I do not claim to know very much about engineering, does seem to me to promise some success, first, in the way of deepening the channel and have it remain permanently deepened, and, secondly, in inviting commerce.

The Senator from Missouri says something about building a bridge across a river. I would say that I would vote to build a bridge across a river where it was necessary to transport stuff from one side to the other, but I would not spend \$1,100,000 for a bridge across any river if you can get your stuff across another bridge for \$10,000 a year. I would not believe in covering the entire river with bridges when one bridge would do the work.

The Senator says that they anticipate an increase of commerce. I think the figures have been pointed out here, and I do not think anybody will dispute it or show figures to the contrary, that the water-carrying freight has decreased and decreased until it is almost a nullity on rivers that used to carry heavy commerce.

I think the time is coming back, however, and is not very far distant, when our rivers shall have been properly developed, that we may have a carrying trade in the way of small launches and small craft that will make these waterways and these lakes very valuable. I think our mails will be carried that way, and I think things will be transported that way and without the necessity of much excavation, but rather by means of dams and reservoirs; but as to expending the amount of money in this bill without getting any returns, I can not see the sense of it.

The Senator says another thing. He says that this matter is being argued upon the theory that the traffic will never be increased.

I say, in answer to that, the facts show that the traffic is not increasing, but decreasing instead, where it has already been developed and where money has been expended. I want to ask whether it is fair to assume that when rivers have been improved and millions of dollars have been put into these things or taken out of it, whichever way you put it, and no increase in traffic has resulted on those stretches that have been improved, but, on the contrary, the traffic has decreased, have we got to take the board's word for it that in their judgment

it is going to increase. That is something entirely beyond the province of a board to say or even to know.

It is a matter that lies within the knowledge of any Senator or for that matter within the knowledge of any citizen, at least his guess is as good as another's; and I will take the judgment of no head of the Board of Engineers on that proposition when experience negatives the conclusion. If a man has only a little common sense—I do not care what his learning is—and will look up the statistics and base his idea upon them, he will find that notwithstanding \$850,000,000 have been poured into these things, the traffic on rivers has decreased instead of increased.

I have a good deal of respect for a man's opinion when he says he does not believe it will increase when we have put the last million dollars into it. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether he expects me or any other Senator to take the board's word for it? We can not expect to get any return until \$20,000,000 have been put into it, until the matter is absolutely completed, and then the harvest is going to come all at once, and in the meantime we must put our faith in the board's judgment and must close our eyes to the facts and the experience of the past.

I have heard a great many stories of that kind told about other enterprises when the thing did not begin to pan out, and you were told just to keep on paying in your assessments, and when the thing is completed it surely would hand you a gold brick, or something equivalent in value to it.

Now, proceeding with Col. Deakyn's report, he said:

12. The reduction in rail rates resulting from the possibility of water transportation is not a simple subject. There is no question that towns having water transportation are for that reason favored with lower rates than other places having no water transportation and requiring equal rail haul. It is my understanding that this condition is recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is frequently argued that if the improvement of a river gives lower rail rates, such improvement is justified even if the river never carries a ton of freight. This might be true if there were no other method of controlling rail rates, but in these days when the railroads claim that they are being regulated too much, there appears to be no lack of governmental machinery for controlling them, and it does not seem necessary to spend \$20,000,000 to bring about a proper rail rate between Kansas City and St. Louis.

That is pretty good sense. We have got an Interstate Commerce Commission and we have a railroad commission in my State, and I presume they have them in other States, and we have intrusted to them the duties of rate making. I do not share the belief that a great many entertain that the railroad commissions are perfect and that they are regulating rates in such way that they go up or down, according to the increase or decrease in expense and the amount of business—the tonnage. It is a very inelastic system. The pressure is put on the commission when business is poor to raise their rates, and complacent commissions oftentimes raise them; and after having raised them, when business has increased like it has done at the present time, for instance, we hear no more about lowering them back to where they were before they were raised. Some time ago the railroads made a great outcry that they were not paying expenses, and the matter was investigated. The rates were raised. Now, business has come with a rush, and I understand they are hard-set to carry the transportation of the country. The high rate sticks, nevertheless, and I do not believe it will ever be pulled down, at least not on the initiative of any board, and hardly on the initiative of the railroads.

So I say I do not share in the belief that the rates are always just as they should be, but the power is always there, and I do not assume that a rate commission would find a justification for lowering the rates or keeping them high merely because of water competition. I do not think that is a sound proposition. I know it has been contended by the railroads that they are justified in lowering their rates and charging for a long haul less than for a shorter haul where they are met with water competition, but I do not think that is sound. I do not think that the railroad commission is going to hold that way.

I think it is immaterial what competition they have. The question is, Are they earning a reasonable return on their investment? If they are, it does not make any difference what their competition is or whether it subjects them to the competition of lower rates, they are held to a fair and reasonable rate, nevertheless.

There is another answer to that proposition, and perhaps a better one. Now, we have an illustration out where I live. I know in the little town I live in we are paying, or used to pay, 25 cents more per ton for coal than was paid for a ton in a city 22 miles farther on. The railroad said that they made that rate because of the competition on Winnebago Lake and Fox River. The tonnage on that is quite small, indeed, and I presume that the railroads just put that as an excuse for hitting our people

for 25 cents a ton more than they did the people of the city 22 miles farther on. But assuming it to be sound in the sense that they should have the right to lower rates as against the public, yet, as a matter of fairness to those living inland, is it just and right that they should charge less for a greater service than for a lesser one and make somebody else pay for it?

The trouble with this argument is that if a town is on a river that has a potential carrying capacity and a railroad lowers rates from that place, they think they must raise it somewhere else; and they come to the commission and have it raised because they are not earning enough on their investment.

Is it a justification for the voting of money out of the Public Treasury to lower somebody else's transportation rates in a city on a river when it is known that it will correspondingly increase the rates of those off the river? In other words, are they justified in taxing you to help some purely local interests?

Perhaps that argument might be extended, and you may say, Well, what is the use of expending public moneys for harbors or Lake ports and sea ports? The answer to that is that it helps the whole country, and everybody is benefited by a general lowering of rates. But that argument will not hold good on river transportation where there are railroads running close by and where water transportation can lower rates only locally. Thus, people away from the river will not load their stuff into a railroad car 8 or 10 miles away from the river and run to the river and pay the cost of unloading and putting it on board and pay for retransporting it when it gets to its destination at another point 8 or 10 miles out, because of the 20 per cent saving. That would be swallowed up and more, and they would get no benefit out of it. So the benefit is purely local.

So I say that appeals to me as being a pretty good statement by the colonel, and I will proceed now with the further reading of his report.

13. In some cases the improvement of a stream is justified, even at high expense, where the absence of rail transportation leaves the territory along the stream entirely dependent on water transportation.

That is a fair statement. Our people have got to have a way to get out their stuff, and it is entirely justifiable for the Government to help them: if they can, because they are entitled to some service.

Now, he goes on and says:

This is not the case with the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth. Over a great part of the distance the river is paralleled with railroads on both banks, and there are few localities that have no railroad within easy reach.

14. There remains to be considered the question of prospective commerce, and in my opinion the improvement must stand or fall by this criterion.

Coming to the point now made by the Senator from Missouri:

In the survey report upon which the present project is based the prospective commerce was given by the president of the Missouri Valley River Improvement Association as 1,000,000 tons. (See p. 45 of H. Doc. No. 1120, 60th Cong., 2d sess.) That estimate was based upon a 10-foot channel, with six or seven boats especially adapted to the navigation of the Missouri River, handling cargoes of 2,000 tons each, and making one round trip per week during a navigation season of 10 months. The fact is that anyone can make almost any estimate he sees fit as to the prospective commerce. I think a better way to approach the subject is by inquiry concerning a river that has been improved.

I should like to know whether that is not a rather sensible suggestion? He says anybody can make a guess as to what is going to happen, and then he asks whether the better way is not to inquire what has happened on the streams that have been improved. That is just the suggestion I made a little while ago. Also it seems to me to be an entirely proper one.

An example is the Mississippi between the mouth of the Ohio and the mouth of the Missouri.

That is just above the point in question.

In the annual reports of the Chief of Engineers this stretch of river is reported as having a navigable depth of 6 feet or more during the entire navigation season of recent years. The commerce for the calendar year 1913 was 258,709 short tons, not including sand and gravel or ferry traffic. It should be noted that this stretch of river is so situated as to draw commerce from the improved stretches of the Mississippi above and below it, as well as from the Ohio and the Missouri. If the Mississippi under these conditions and with a 6-foot channel carries 258,000 tons, it seems to me doubtful whether the Missouri with the same depth will carry any more. The Missouri River traffic would have to increase sevenfold to equal that on the above section of the Mississippi; and would have to increase a hundredfold to reach a figure commensurate with the cost of the work.

I wonder whether anybody is so enthusiastic as to contend that if this additional \$10,000,000 is spent, or \$20,000,000 in all, traffic on the Missouri is going to increase a hundredfold in order to reach a figure commensurate with the cost of the work. I do not know whether I need to dwell on that. I do not think anyone with the wildest imagination possible can figure out that it will ever increase a hundredfold. I do not think the Board of Engineers would say that or have said it, and yet it

appears that that is the figure necessary to be reached to be "commensurate with the cost of the work."

15. From the foregoing considerations I am of the opinion that the present and reasonably prospective commerce on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth is not sufficient to warrant the continuance of the present project. I think the snagging should be continued, so that commerce may have the advantage of the natural depth of the river and the river shall not be allowed to become entirely obstructed. Any attempt at partial improvement seems futile, because the draft of boats, and therefore their cargoes, will be determined by the least existing depth. If the river is improved at all, the work should be complete as to protection of banks and control of channel. For the same reason it seems to me injudicious to spend any money in keeping up the works already built. If in another generation the improvement of the river becomes advisable, the present works will be of little value, and in the meantime the channel depth in the portions that have been improved are not likely to be less than in the portions wholly unimproved.

16. It is to be noted that these views agree in many respects with the previous attitude of the Engineer Department, as expressed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors June 8, 1908, and by the Chief of Engineers December 2, 1908, in action on survey report published in House Document No. 1120, Sixtieth Congress, second session.

Now, we have, it seems, two boards who have approved these views, and so I do not see why our friend, Col. Deakne, should have been so terribly humiliated when another board with a new Chief of Engineers differed from him and went and overturned all the precedents of his predecessors in office before he got there. By the way, this same Gen. Black has only been chief, I think, since December; at least it is less than a year since his predecessor went out. So here comes a new chief, Gen. Black, according to the statement of the Senator from Missouri, and overturns the reports not only of Col. Deakne but of boards who have also looked into this project.

The views of the board as to the utility of partial improvement and the wastefulness of inadequate and irregular appropriations are of particular interest. The Missouri River Commission in its final report also expressed the opinion that there was no middle course between mere snagging and through systematic improvement.

17. I recommend that the present project be modified so as to provide for snagging alone at an estimated cost of \$40,000 per year and that all other work be stopped.

HERBERT DEAKNE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

I desire to have printed here the report of Col. Herbert Deakne in full.

REEXAMINATION OF MISSOURI RIVER FROM KANSAS CITY, MO., TO THE MOUTH.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Kansas City, Mo., April 22, 1915.

From: The District Engineer Officer.

To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army
(Through the Division Engineer).

Subject: Reexamination of project, Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth.

1. In compliance with instructions contained in department letter dated March 18, 1915, I submit the following report giving my general views on the question of the modification or abandonment of the project for the improvement of the Missouri River from Kansas City to the mouth. This report is called for by section 14 of the river and harbor act approved March 4, 1915.

2. The project for this improvement was adopted by Congress July 25, 1912, in the following language:

"Improving Missouri River, with a view to securing a permanent six-foot channel between Kansas City and the mouth of the river, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document Numbered Twelve hundred and eighty-seven, Sixty-first Congress, third session, and with a view to the completion of such improvement within a period of ten years, eight hundred thousand dollars: *Provided*, That cooperation from the localities benefited may be required in the prosecution of the said project in case any comprehensive plan is hereafter adopted by Congress for an apportionment of expense generally applicable to river and other projects in which any improvement now or hereafter adopted confers special or exceptional benefit upon the localities affected: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall postpone the expenditure of the amount hereby appropriated or any further appropriation for said project without action by Congress."

However, the first appropriation for the work was made June 25, 1910, in the following language:

"Improving Missouri River, with a view to securing a permanent six-foot channel between Kansas City and the mouth of the river, one million dollars: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall appoint a board of three officers to further consider and report upon the most economical and desirable plan of securing such channel, in which report consideration will be given to the subject of cooperation on the part of local interests in the work of said improvement: *Provided further*, That the report hereby authorized shall be submitted to Congress on or before the opening of its next regular session."

3. The appropriations and allotments made for this project are as follows:

June 25, 1910	\$1,000,000
Feb. 27, 1911, authorized	600,000
Aug. 24, 1912, appropriated	800,000
July 25, 1912	2,000,000
Mar. 4, 1913	850,000
Oct. 2, 1914	1,000,000
Mar. 4, 1915	

Total of 6 appropriations 6,250,000

It will be noted that the appropriations have been made at about half the rate mentioned in the act adopting the project.

4. The expenditures to March 4, 1915, were \$2,577,290.85, consisting of \$3,286,082.59 for improvement and \$291,208.26 for maintenance. It is estimated that the project is about 9 per cent completed. There have been large expenditures for plant since the inception of the project, and for that reason and on account of the lack of appropriations at the proper rate, the amount expended and the percentage completed appear out of proportion. But it has been demonstrated that the work can be done within the estimated unit cost, and it is my opinion that with appropriations at the rate of \$2,000,000 per year for improvement and sufficient funds for maintenance the project could be completed within the total estimated cost.

5. The cost of maintenance after completion of the project is estimated at \$500,000 per year. The maintenance work, including snagging, is now costing about \$100,000 per year. It will gradually increase as the work progresses. If appropriations are continued at the rate of about \$1,000,000 per year, and the maintenance increases from \$100,000 to \$500,000 per year, averaging \$300,000 per year during the execution of the work, it is plain that over 20 years from this time will be required to complete the project.

6. I consider that the question of modifying or abandoning the project is one to be decided by a comparison of the cost involved with the benefits derived. Assuming the money of the Government to be worth 3 per cent interest, the total estimated cost of the project represents \$600,000 per year interest. Adding the maintenance cost of \$500,000 per year gives \$1,100,000 per year as the permanent charge to the Government resulting from the execution and maintenance of this project.

7. The benefits derived are represented by the increased facilities for navigation. There are other incidental benefits, such as the protection of lands from erosion and the amelioration of flood conditions, but these have not been recognized as proper objects of Government expenditure on the Missouri River and are therefore not considered in the analysis.

8. The commerce to be considered is present and prospective, and the advantages that commerce will obtain from the improvement are the actual saving in freight charges by the use of the river and the effect on railroad freight rates produced by the possibility of water transportation.

9. The commerce for the calendar year 1914 is not yet fully tabulated. For 1913 it was as follows:

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.	Average haul.	Rate per ton-mile.
	Customary units.	Short tons.			
Grain.....	253,940 bushels.....	6,701	\$195,303.38	123	\$0.0091
Hay.....	114	2,049.66	106		.0155
Feed and flour.....	334	9,538.88	8		.0670
Oil.....	46 barrels.....	12	345.00	8	.0483
Manufacture of iron and steel.....	1,655	897,790.50	291		.0089
Live stock.....	4,800 head.....	945	137,039.20	31	.0403
Salt.....	145 barrels.....	22	259.00	9	.0510
Sand and gravel.....	1,735 cubic yards.....	2,513	1,646.00	9	.0557
Brick.....	4,800	16	56.90	9	.0349
Cement.....	534 barrels.....	107	1,152.90	26	.0346
Lumber.....	75,360 feet b. m.....	183	2,976.60	13	.0333
Other building material.....	15	1,088.00	10		.0415
Railroad ties.....	128,908	10,312	62,697.50	14	.0085
Produce.....	196	22,370.40	125		.0114
Wood.....	531 cords.....	847	2,135.60	9	.1002
Miscellaneous.....	13,579	2,520,734.80	237		.0093
Logs and lumber rafted.....	43,000 feet b. m.....	107	473.00	150	(¹)
Sand and gravel barged.....	233,133 cubic yards.....	303,577	71,555.00	1	(¹)
Total.....		347,235	3,929,212.32		

¹ Owner.

10. The items that are not benefited by improvement of the river are the sand and gravel barged and the logs and lumber rafted. They amount to 309,684 tons. Ferry traffic is not counted in reporting the commerce on the Missouri River.

11. Eliminating the logs and the sand and gravel barged, the remaining traffic is 37,551 tons, divided into classes which are carried over average distances of from 8 to 291 miles. The total freight charge on this traffic was about \$41,000. The Kansas City-Missouri River Navigation Co., the only through line on the river, operating between Kansas City and St. Louis, charges 80 per cent of the railroad freight rates. Assuming this to be the relation between the rail and water rates for the entire traffic, the saving to shippers by the use of the river in 1913 was about \$10,000. It is evident that this saving is entirely inadequate to warrant the serious consideration of an expenditure by the Government of \$1,100,000 per year in interest and maintenance.

12. The reduction in rail rates resulting from the possibility of water transportation is not a simple subject. There is no question that towns having water transportation are for that reason favored with lower rates than other places having no water transportation and requiring equal rail haul. It is my understanding that this condition is recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is frequently argued that if the improvement of a river gives lower rail rates, such improvement is justified even if the river never carries a ton of freight. This might be true if there were no other method of controlling rail rates, but in these days when the railroads claim that they are being regulated too much, there appears to be no lack of governmental machinery for controlling them, and it does not seem necessary to spend \$20,000,000 to bring about a proper rail rate between Kansas City and St. Louis.

13. In some cases the improvement of a stream is justified, even at high expense, where the absence of rail transportation leaves the territory along the stream entirely dependent on water transportation. This is not the case with the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth. Over a great part of the distance the river is paralleled with railroads on both banks, and there are few localities that have no railroad within easy reach.

14. There remains to be considered the question of prospective commerce, and in my opinion the improvement must stand or fall by this criterion. In the survey report upon which the present project is based,

the prospective commerce was given by the president of the Missouri Valley River Improvement Association as 1,000,000 tons. See page 45 of House Document No. 1120, Sixtieth Congress, second session. That estimate was based upon a 10-foot channel, with six or seven boats especially adapted to the navigation of the Missouri River, handling cargoes of 2,000 tons each, and making one round trip per week during a navigation season of 10 months. The fact is that anyone can make almost any estimate he sees fit as to the prospective commerce. I think a better way to approach the subject is by inquiry concerning a river that has been improved. An example is the Mississippi between the mouth of the Ohio and the mouth of the Missouri. In the annual reports of the Chief of Engineers this stretch of river is reported as having a navigable depth of 6 feet or more during the entire navigation season of recent years. The commerce for the calendar year 1913 was 258,700 short tons, not including sand and gravel or ferry traffic. It should be noted that this stretch of river is so situated as to draw commerce from the improved stretches of the Mississippi above and below it as well as from the Ohio and the Missouri. If the Mississippi under these conditions and with a 6-foot channel carries 258,000 tons, it seems to me doubtful whether the Missouri with the same depth will carry any more. The Missouri River traffic would have to increase sevenfold to equal that on the above section of the Mississippi, and would have to increase a hundredfold to reach a figure commensurate with the cost of the work.

15. From the foregoing considerations I am of the opinion that the present and reasonably prospective commerce on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth is not sufficient to warrant the continuance of the present project. I think the snagging should be continued, so that commerce may have the advantage of the natural depth of the river and the river shall not be allowed to become entirely obstructed. Any attempt at partial improvement seems futile, because the draft of boats, and therefore their cargoes, will be determined by the least existing depth. If the river is improved at all, the work should be complete as to protection of banks and control of channel. For the same reason it seems to me injudicious to spend any money in keeping up the works already built. If in another generation the improvement of the river becomes advisable, the present works will be of little value, and in the meantime the channel depth in the portions that have been improved are not likely to be less than in the portions wholly unimproved.

16. It is to be noted that these views agree in many respects with the previous attitude of the Engineer Department, as expressed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors June 8, 1908, and by the Chief of Engineers December 2, 1908, in action on survey report published in House Document No. 1120, Sixtieth Congress, second session. The views of the board as to the futility of partial improvement and the wastefulness of inadequate and irregular appropriations, are of particular interest. The Missouri River Commission in its final report also expressed the opinion that there was no middle course between mere snagging and thorough systematic improvement.

17. I recommend that the present project be modified so as to provide for snagging alone at an estimated cost of \$40,000 per year, and that all other work be stopped.

HERBERT DEAKYNE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

That is not all. There was another report made by C. McD. Townsend, colonel, Corps of Engineers:

[First indorsement.]

OFFICE DIVISION ENGINEER, WESTERN DIVISION,
St. Louis, Mo., May 22, 1915.

Just a year ago—

TO THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY:

1. Forwarded, concurring in the opinion of the district officer that the existing river commerce is not sufficient to justify the permanent improvement of the Missouri River from Kansas City to its mouth, but not approving the recommendation that the work should be entirely abandoned.

2. It is believed that there is still opportunity for the revival of western river commerce, but that it should first be sought not in the tributaries but in the main river. There is neither the density of population nor of material seeking shipment on the tributaries of the Mississippi, with the exception of the Ohio, to cause such a revival which will be in the nature of a revolution of the existing methods of transportation and will naturally originate at large centers of population, such as Chicago, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and New Orleans, where large amounts of manufactured products are seeking shipment. The agricultural products originating on a river bank are not sufficient to justify a large expenditure for the improvement of the river channel. With a revival of commerce on the main stream its extension to the tributaries will gradually follow.

3. The fact, however, that there has been a failure to properly utilize the improved channel that has been maintained during the past 10 years from St. Louis to New Orleans should cause Congress to hesitate before continuing the large appropriations it is making for the western rivers.

4. In the opinion of the division engineer the problem of developing our western rivers should be treated as a single one. Instead of scattering appropriations over the entire western territory, a channel of 8 or 9 feet depth should first be provided from Chicago to New Orleans, and the offer of assistance in the construction of a canal along the Des Plaines River from the State of Illinois accepted. An opportunity should then be afforded the American people to determine whether they want waterways, not by rhetorical efforts in river conventions, but by a practical utilization of the channel thus afforded. Until such revival occurs appropriations on the tributaries should be confined to maintaining the existing status. The existing works should not be allowed to deteriorate. At present an annual appropriation of \$150,000 for snagging and the maintenance of existing works is therefore recommended.

C. McD. TOWNSEND,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

So that here the colonel of the Corps of Engineers—the head of the division—approves Col. Deakayne's report with the exception that he does not favor the abandonment of the present project, but believes Congress should continue to appropriate \$150,000 a year.

That is what the men on the ground thought of this proposition. I submit in all fairness to the Senate whether their facts which are practically admitted to be true and the inferences

they have drawn from those facts and the reasons given by them are not far superior to any which the Board of Engineers has given.

I should like to have this report printed in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. HUSTING. Let us dig into this proposition and see whether or not in its essence it is merely a commercial waterway scheme. In the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in House Document 463, page 7, there appears the following:

15. It has been estimated that, with the channel held by revetted banks, there would be available for agricultural purposes in the bottom land along the river between Kansas City and St. Louis, 500,000 acres, the greater part of which would be less than a mile distant from the river, and a considerable portion of which is now necessarily nonproducing. It is claimed that this area would contribute very substantially to the river traffic.

Page 210, report of 1914 of Chief Kingman, shows also the situation:

WHERE THE MONEY GOES.

To show specifically why \$1,552,650 was recommended by Col. Deakne for land-reclamation purposes in 1915, and \$1,000,000 paid by Chief Kingman, I quote from page 2510, report 1914, on this 400 miles of the Missouri, along which Army engineers estimate 500,000 acres will be saved, valued at \$100 to \$125 per acre—land belonging to private interests deeply interested in this \$20,000,000 project:

During the coming fiscal year it is proposed to carry on work with the funds for which allotments have been approved in the completion of contracts now in force and in work by day labor and Government plant, as follows:

97,500 linear feet standard revetment, at \$10	\$975,000
11,000 linear feet concrete revetment, at \$10	110,000
21,950 linear feet 3-row standard dike, at \$15	329,250
Maintenance of improvement	25,000
New plant	13,400
Snagging and repairs to plant	50,000
Surveys and superintendence	50,000

Other work will be done if appropriations are made.

This work is expected to result in greater permanence and depth of channel in the improved sections and greater ease of navigation.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOTMENTS (ON THIS PRESENT PROJECT).

June 25, 1910	\$1,000,000
July 25, 1912	800,000
Aug. 24, 1912	600,000
Mar. 4, 1913	2,000,000
Oct. 2, 1914	850,000

Total of appropriations 5,250,000

A \$60,000,000 LAND RECLAMATION PROJECT.

One million four hundred thousand dollars was demanded for 25 miles of revetment and diking in 1915.

It appears from this that these men who speculated in these swamp-river bottoms along the banks of the Missouri are reaping the advantages of the work of the Government. It is a reclamation scheme pure and simple. The only difference is that in most reclamation projects the Government makes the project pay for itself either because of increased price for Government lands or some other device. Here the Government steps in and disburses millions, and as far as I know never receives anything in return.

The figures above show that 90 to 95 per cent of the money expended is going to reclaim the lands of the owners of these 500,000 acres. It appears as though somebody were getting rich off of the charity of the United States.

16. Interested parties invite attention to the readjustment of transcontinental railway rates that is being made as a result of traffic through the Panama Canal. The effect of these changes is to give pronounced advantage to Eastern seaboard industries for the Pacific coast trade, and thus to handicap the interior manufacturers, and it is claimed that their only hope of retaining a competitive position is in having the benefit of cheap water routes to the sea. An improved channel in the Missouri would connect with the effective channel already provided in the Mississippi and give such a route from Kansas City to the Gulf of Mexico.

Hon. JAMES A. FREAR said, in the House on January 10, page 1115, RECORD:

INFLUENCE ON FREIGHT RATES—STONE-AGE STATESMEN.

Any attempt to sift worthless projects from waterway bills is hooted down by a few stone-age statesmen and lobby agents who affect to believe that millions of dollars in Government money now annually thrown away on private-land reclamation, private water powers, and deserted rivers, in some indefinite way will serve to reduce freight rates for the public at large; that those who oppose wasteful waterway bills are thereby preventing a reduction in railway tariffs. No well-informed man will so argue to an intelligent audience, and it is significant that railways now contribute liberally to waterway lobbies to secure Government-built railway, water terminals, and other private privileges. Under existing law any undue loss in income on one branch of the railroad must be made up on the rest of the system to secure reasonable rates guaranteed under the Constitution, and yet the Government is asked to waste millions on favored communities to be paid out of taxes contributed by other communities.

Men who oppose waterway waste are among those who have demanded strict railway regulation.

Speaking personally, as before stated, with my colleague [Mr. LENOX] and other State legislators I was identified with the passage of railway-regulation laws which were secured in Wisconsin after a lively fight lasting several years. Having the greatest waterway commerce

of any State in the country, with one exception, and with the two greatest lakes and greatest river in the world washing its borders, Wisconsin is profoundly interested in genuine waterway development, but she will never come to the Government Treasury under the pretense that railway freight rates are to be lowered by such means.

Her railway commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission have abundant powers to control such rates and have exercised those powers effectually. The same situation is true in practically every State that cares to use the constitutional rights it possesses.

If the railroads must reduce rates to meet the competition of water at points along the Missouri River or any other river they will raise the rates at some inland point to make up the difference, or they will be forced to raise the rates on commodities that can not by their nature be the subject of river traffic.

What shippers and growers and manufacturers want is to get their products to the market as quickly as possible. Therein lies the primary reason for the triumph of railroads and electric roads over that branch of the traffic which takes the slower water route. The more money that is lavished on the rivers of this country the less grows the commerce that exists upon the particular streams. They seem to be shifting in adverse proportion.

I have some more figures here which I do not feel as though I want to take up the time of the Senate to read, but I should like to have them included also in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUSTING. I have some figures here on the Ohio River which have been presented to the Senate at former sessions, and I think also at this session and in my opinion in this debate. It would be only duplicating what I have said to read these figures. I think it is a fair statement to say that the figures concerning the Ohio River show the same state of affairs.

The Ohio River gets, under this bill, an appropriation of \$5,509,000. Congress has already appropriated \$53,000,000 for this purpose, and to complete the locks and dams it will take \$38,601,488 more. That makes a total of something like \$91,000,000 for this project.

The figures in connection with the Ohio River improvement and the rates of traffic going through different locks when analyzed, as they have been in this printed statement which I am going to put in in connection with my remarks, and which I do not care to go over and discuss at this time, show that, when the figures are analyzed right down to the bone, the traffic carried on is entirely incommensurate with the expenditures, and that if it is merely to figure out the saving of the 20 per cent, not only as to the traffic which is actually carried on the river, but that which is tributary to it, there can not be any doubt in anybody's mind that it would well pay the Government to pay out as a bonus the actual amount of freight charges paid by shippers on the actual amount of saving made by them, and it would not make a dent in the appropriation.

I am going to have this also printed in connection with my remarks.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, July 27, 1914.

Hon. S. M. SPARKMAN,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
United States House of Representatives.

SIR: 1. Referring to the statement of the commercial statistics of the Ohio River, telephoned to you some time since, I have the honor to inform you that a report just received from the district officer states that the commercial statistics which he reported by telegraph have been found upon careful check to have contained some duplication. A corrected tabular statement of the statistics is herewith.

2. As to the reason for reporting the statistics at only six locks, it may be stated that the particular locks were selected with a view to obtaining as complete statistics as possible, and at the same time to eliminate duplication as much as practicable. Boats with through tows are required to report only at the first lock through which they pass. The item for open-river commerce is the local commerce carried on between the various locks and dams.

Very respectfully,

DAN C. KINGMAN,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Ohio River tonnage, calendar year 1913.

[Through lock and open river.]

	Tonnage.	Valuation.	Passengers.
Lock No. 1	1,982,257.5	\$3,720,794.26	86,518
Lock No. 8	224,080.5	1,095,666.92	5,005
Lock No. 18	374,945.0	2,336,645.31	9,421
Lock No. 28	796,629.0	2,926,918.65	17,266
Lock No. 37	1,988,434.0	9,953,466.24	104,678
Lock No. 41	1,537,146.5	6,318,567.53	11,767
Open river	1,503,111.5	14,088,452.70	1,086,897
Ferries	1,401,519.5	36,083,390.07	2,949,834
Total	9,814,123.3	77,026,901.78	4,270,783

A corrected statement of average freight floated on the Ohio, based upon official lock reports, is now presented over Chief Kingman's signature, and invites scrutiny.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 1.

Lock 1 is given 1,982,257 tons. But page 2711 says that is commerce which passed through the lock—"and open river"—at that point. The table further shows that of the impressive tonnage reported, including duplications, 1,946,119 tons consisted of soft coal, sand, and gravel that was always floated down the "open river," leaving a commerce of 36,135 tons, including 11,240 tons of floatable logs and ties, or less than 25,000 tons, that may or may not have required the services of this \$100,000,000 lock system.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 8.

Lock 8 and "open river" is given 224,080 tons by Chief Kingman, page 2712. Of that traffic, so reported, soft coal and railroad ties, that for a half century were floated down the open river, reached 207,429 tons, leaving 16,651 tons of cement and other reported freight at that point for which a \$100,000,000 lock system is being built under the recommendation of Army engineers.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 18.

Other lock statistics are of the same character. For fear this statement may not be accepted, as based on investigation, I will take the next lock. Chief Kingman's next lock, 18, and "open river" statistics are found on page 2713. He reports a total "commerce" of 374,945 tons, whereas out of an even 50 items reported, 2 items of soft coal and logs reached 342,836 tons. Just what method was taken for shipping some 7,000 tons of oil and 2,500 tons of lumber, found in the remaining 48 items, the report fails to disclose. One thing is certain amid all this attempt to impress Congress with inflated statistics of open-river and lock traffic, the Government is annually paying bills reaching, with the regular and sundry civil bills, from \$5,000,000 to \$8,000,000 for the Ohio River alone, for a comparatively insignificant commerce average along the river, apart from soft coal, sand, and gravel, of less than 50,000 tons at given points, as shown by the official reports.

The same is true of the Mississippi River. I have only taken the Missouri River because I have had it more in detail, but what I have said in regard to the Missouri River is largely, if not entirely, true with regard to the Mississippi proposition.

A large part of the 600 miles between St. Louis and Minneapolis borders on the boundaries of my State. It is proposed to spend this year the sum of \$1,200,000 on this project. According to the plans it is proposed to complete the entire Mississippi project at a cost of \$166,000,000. All this \$20,000,000 either is going or has gone on that part of the river which lies between St. Louis and Minneapolis. Does the traffic warrant it?

I say that the analysis that I have here, which I have taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, contains tables—which I believe to be true, but if they are not correct I should like to have them corrected—to show that it is entirely disproportionate to the amount of money expended under the present system and in the manner it has been done, and that it is impossible for anybody to sit down and figure out where the United States Government could be justified in expending that tremendous amount of money, judging by the returns that we have from this expenditure.

Upper Mississippi River freight statement for 1913.

Designation.	Short tons.	Ton-miles.	Valuation.
Logs.....	64,489	30,245,340	\$315,271
Rafted lumber, shingles, etc.....	13,570	4,400,147	190,001
Miscellaneous freight.....	1,294,864	12,229,310	31,417,968
United States material.....	772,392	9,445,576	781,897
Total.....	2,145,315	56,320,373	32,705,137

Classified freight traffic, 1913.

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.	Average haul.	Ton-miles.
	Customary units.	Short tons.			
Apples.....	160,090 barrels.....	11,505	\$200,215	34.4	395,959
Automobiles.....	5,703.....	6,034	9,545,950	3.8	23,014
Brick.....	192,190 pieces.....	981	3,052	7.3	7,157
Brush.....	656,644 cubic yards.....	82,450	170,191	20.6	1,700,694
Cement.....	4,305 tons.....	4,305	34,378	9.9	425,790
Coal.....	26,236 tons.....	26,236	90,400	13.5	354,401
Corn.....	119,090 bushels.....	3,463	77,431	6.4	22,144
Farm produce.....	13,565 tons.....	13,565	359,319	23.5	318,900
Fish.....	6,539 tons.....	6,539	666,600	9.8	62,486
Gravel.....	268,103 cubic yards.....	398,179	195,242	9.1	3,621,435
Hay.....	2,615 tons.....	2,615	44,269	5.4	14,122
Lath.....	2,056,000 pieces.....	1,018	10,575	317.2	322,989
Live stock.....	58,954 head.....	28,713	5,218,730	6.6	190,202
Logs.....	8,904,380 feet b. m.....	98,268	463,631	316.2	31,074,221
Lumber.....	19,167,689 feet b. m.....	30,408	467,775	138.0	4,195,827
Merchandise.....	17,101 tons.....	17,101	2,107,830	126.9	2,17,089
Oats.....	3,550 bushels.....	55	1,775	1.0	55
Rock.....	535,143 cubic yards.....	708,066	562,077	11.3	7,976,674
Sand.....	430,173 cubic yards.....	562,040	209,143	4.7	2,653,545
Shells.....	11,428 tons.....	11,428	246,229	42.9	490,801
Shingles.....	622,000 pieces.....	65	1,866	1.3	85
Teams.....	23,501.....	26,609	6,540,900	1.7	46,537
Wheat.....	11,500 bushels.....	382	12,347	7.9	3,015
Wood.....	21,847 cords.....	34,248	108,213	16.4	560,865
Miscellaneous.....	71,042 tons.....	71,042	5,366,996	231.0	1,642,366
Total.....		2,145,315	32,705,137	26.2	56,322,373

A comparative statement of upper-river commerce is also offered by years, during which period between \$20,000,000 and \$25,000,000 have been expended by the Government on the advice of Army engineers. While the 1913 commerce was only about 35 per cent of that floated in 1885, it will be ascertained upon analysis that over nine-tenths of the 35 per cent floated in 1913 is bogus commerce, or, assuming the 1885 commerce reported to have been legitimate, in 28 years river freight fell approximately 96 per cent.

Mississippi River: Mouth of the Missouri to St. Paul, Minn.

[From reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department.]

	Tonnage.
1885.....	5,607,196
1886.....	3,200,000
1887.....	3,500,000
1888.....	3,750,000
1889.....	3,500,000
1890.....	4,200,000
1891.....	3,300,000
1892.....	3,750,000
1893.....	3,200,000
1894.....	2,975,000
1895.....	3,000,000
1896.....	2,250,000
1897.....	3,200,000
1898.....	2,800,000
1899.....	2,900,000
1900.....	2,400,000
1901.....	2,125,000
1902.....	1,900,000
1903.....	4,545,129
1904.....	4,534,539
1905.....	4,089,318
1906.....	3,847,319
1908.....	2,581,857
1909.....	1,916,114
1910.....	1,836,035
1911.....	2,081,566
1912.....	1,830,294
1913.....	2,145,315

[From reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, 1904, vol. 2, p. 2157, and 1913, vol. 2, p. 2385.]

	Tonnage.
Average tonnage for years 1877 to 1903, inclusive.....	4,615,376
Tonnage in 1912.....	1,830,294
Decrease.....	2,785,082

ENGINEER'S STATISTICS OF COMMERCE (?).

"Commerce" reached 2,145,315 tons in 1913, so the Chief of Engineers reports. Tons of what? Let us see:

	Tons.
Brush for river construction work.....	82,450
Gravel dredged from river.....	398,178
Rock for river work.....	708,000
Sand dredged from river.....	562,000
Logs that have floated for 50 years.....	98,268
Lumber and wood barged.....	64,408
Animal ferried across river.....	55,322
Automobiles ferried across river.....	6,034
Total.....	1,974,980

This quotation from a St. Paul paper shows what is thought of the project by those who are supposed to be interested in this improvement. Here is what the St. Paul Dispatch says:

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, Aug. 12, 1915.]

DEMAND IS SLIGHT FOR RIVER SHIPPING—ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE COMMITTEE FINDS 20 FIRMS USING WATER FREIGHT.

A report made to-day by a special committee of the association of commerce shows little demand at this time for river transportation. An estimated tonnage of 10,464 inbound and 2,472 outbound for one year was made to the committee by 20 out of 64 business firms.

THIRTY-SIX DO NO RIVER BUSINESS.

Thirty-six of the 64 firms said they could do no business by river transportation.

Eight shippers said they may be able to use the river, but were unable to make any definite statement. Several of the largest firms did not reply to the communication sent to them by the committee.

REPORT FOR A YEAR.

The tabulated report for a year showed from foreign ports by way of New Orleans 1,124 tons of freight would come in and only 7 tons go out. From Pacific and Atlantic ports, by way of New Orleans, 4,200 tons will come in and 1,715 go out.

Along the Mississippi River 2,704 tons could be picked up and 165 tons sent to the way points. From St. Louis to St. Paul the inbound is estimated at 606 tons and the outbound at 360. Pittsburgh and other points on the Ohio would send 1,830 and take 225 tons from St. Paul.

TOTAL TONNAGE 12,936.

The total tonnage is estimated by the 20 concerns at 12,936. This is the estimated amount of the business, and not an estimate of all St. Paul firms.

For October 160 tons can be brought in by river and only 3 tons sent out.

The committee which made the investigation is composed of H. T. Quinlan, J. W. Cooper, C. E. Tuttle, C. H. Bigelow, C. J. McConville, Charles Patterson, H. S. Sommers, J. A. Seeger, J. A. Gregg, and J. Clair Stone.

Can anything be added to this tragic statement of a \$20,000,000 expenditure for a waterway that will float about 12,000 tons of commerce for St. Paul annually out of a hundred million tons and over handled by the Twin Cities? Some open-river expenditures ought to be made to provide for the small existing local freight, but \$2,000 per mile annually is a notorious waste of money directly chargeable to the Chief of Engineers.

Yet from his reports we are told, according to a contributed manuscript which will later be considered—

As I say, I have taken probably three of the most promising projects, so far as rivers are concerned, as examples to show the benefits of these river and harbor appropriations. Surely if money could be well expended, or if, what is more to the point, money were being expended to advantage anywhere, it would be upon these streams; but the figures and the facts show that the people are not getting their money's worth from these appropriations. If it is true that even in those instances—and those instances where one would naturally suppose we would get the greatest benefit—those expenditures are not bringing adequate returns, then I should like to know where on earth we could expect any returns from the hundred or more that are incorporated in this bill—items in regard to the improvement of certain creeks and rivers which seem upon their face to be of absolutely no value whatever to anybody?

Another thing. I find here, for instance, that as to the Mississippi River, only yesterday we agreed to abandon a project, which is found on page 36 of the bill, as follows:

Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River: That so much of the adopted project for the construction of a low reservoir dam at Gull Lake, Minn., as provides for the digging of ditches between Gull Lake and Round Lake and between Round Lake and Long Lake is hereby abandoned; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to surrender to the parties entitled thereto the flowage rights on Long Lake and Round Lake heretofore granted the United States for the aforesaid work.

I do not know just how much money has been expended on that particular reservoir, but I merely took the opportunity to look up and to see what was done on that sort of work on the Mississippi River. I find that on reservoirs and headwaters \$1,648,354 has been expended. This bill has been amended by abandoning a part of this project. It may be a small portion of it; I do not know; but it is some portion of it. Not only that, but it is a portion of it in which lie the headwaters of the Mississippi. What is the object of having us vote a million and a half dollars to improve reservoirs on the headwaters of our great streams, which at some time in the future we are going to use as reservoirs, to put in money and actually develop them, and then come here before Congress and in a bill appropriating other moneys for the development of other reservoirs withdraw that appropriation and turn the flowage rights back to the men from whom we secured them? What is the purpose of that?

I find other items here. I found an item which, however, the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] did not insist upon, but a bill was introduced by one of the Senators providing that a part of St. John's River should be abandoned above a certain point—a river on which has been expended several million dollars.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HUSTING. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that that portion of the river never has been improved at all by the Government.

Mr. HUSTING. That may be, if the Senator please. I am not saying anything about that, but here below on the river we are spending millions of dollars to keep it navigable, and a part of the navigability depends upon the headwaters of streams if you want to control the river and to control navigation. So in a bill improving other streams and voting hundreds of millions of dollars we are withdrawing some of them as they become improved from the general jurisdiction of the United States and putting the matter out of the hands of the United States; in other words, we are building up something at a cost of millions of dollars, and then at a sacrifice of thousands and thousands of dollars we are abandoning these things and destroying them. We are spending millions in attempting to build up and then tear down as fast as some of it is built.

There is another thing in this bill, I think, or there is at least another bill here which proposes to surrender the jurisdiction of the Illinois River into the hands of the State of Illinois. What is the object of that?

I think that is a fine illustration, if the Senate will permit me to point it out, of the cross purposes at which we are working. Here we are expending hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars to improve the navigation on Lake Michigan, Lake Superior, and other lakes. We are digging out the bottoms of the lakes and improving our harbors. Then, again, I understand there is a bill coming over here carrying \$45,000,000 to build levees and dikes down in the south end of the Mississippi River. What have we done and what are we doing and what are we going to do?

I am sorry the Senators from Illinois are not here, for I do not want to say anything against something that I know is dear to their hearts, and rightfully so, for it means a good deal to the city of Chicago, but I can not help pointing out the senseless action of the United States in connection with these propositions. I ask what have we done? We have permitted the State of Illinois to turn a river that formerly flowed into Lake Michigan and to throw its waters down into the Mississippi Valley. By doing that we have taken water from where it is needed, beneficial, and handed it to a section of country where it is not wanted and where it is destructive. Now a movement is on foot to give the State of Illinois further jurisdiction over that river; to expend further millions of dollars to deepen that waterway, and to still further tap the navigable waters of the Great Lakes and take greater quantities of water from them.

What is the consequence and what is going to be the consequence? The consequence is that we are going to lower the water and to have lower levels in the Great Lakes. Having lowered the levels of the Great Lakes at great expense to the State of Illinois, we are going to spend millions of dollars to dig out the bottoms of the Lakes for harbor improvement to make up for the lowering of the water caused by the tapping of those Lakes by the Illinois River.

That is not all. Then we are going to vote millions of dollars, to be expended down in Louisiana, to build dikes, so that these waters which have been withdrawn and are destroying our navigability on the Lakes are going to overflow and destroy their property down there. Money is being spent to lower our Lakes, then money must be spent to deepen our harbors because of the lowering of the Lakes, and then money is to be spent to protect property from floods caused by the spending of money in the lowering of our Lakes. It is a waste all around to spend money to no purpose. What kind of a proposition is that? Is that good business sense? Yet those are the things that are going on all the time.

Here in a report that I have is a list of abandoned canals. Of canals, we have abandoned in this country 2,444 miles, which cost us in the neighborhood of \$81,171,374; canals that we have built with public money, but which we have abandoned. What is the use of digging canals if we do not want them? But if we have to finance them, what is the use of throwing them back and giving them away? I say, what is the use of giving the State of Illinois, great though her needs may be, the possibilities of destroying the commerce on the Great Lakes by making it necessary for us to appropriate moneys to dig out our harbors and then turn around and because of what we have done, at least in part, because of the additional waters that have been thrown into the Mississippi Valley, we have to vote additional millions to put up dikes to keep those waters which have been thrown away, or which have been withdrawn from beneficial use and which turned into a destructive force, from destroying the lives and property of our citizens in the South?

Not only that, but I understand that almost all of these great waterway schemes involve revetting, which only can be defended upon the theory that it is to drain land, to reclaim land, which is something that has no part in a river and harbor bill. That is another question and another story; and they can not justify that expenditure on the ground that it is going to reclaim certain lands on the banks of the Missouri or on the banks of the Mississippi or on the banks of the Ohio. That is not a part of a proper waterway scheme. That is a reclamation scheme, not a scheme of navigation.

But, aside from that, what are we doing? We are also discharging water through those lands with greater rapidity, with the result of making greater floods down in the Mississippi Valley. The States are permitting the citizens to straighten out the streams, to reclaim the swamp lands; we are permitting them to cut down the forests, destroy the swamps, destroy the springs, all with the result that the water is being hurried down the Mississippi Valley just as fast as we can get it there. Then, when we do that, and it causes floods down in Louisiana, they want us to expend \$45,000,000 to take care of those floods.

There was a time when nature took care of the floods. There is not any question in my mind that the Mississippi River Valley, or those flood areas or those parts of the river and lands adjacent thereto, were naturally subject to periodical floods; but it is going to be worse and worse, unless we find some way to correct it. It is true they can not help it down there; but they ought not to aid in doing certain things, and the people of those States ought to aid in doing certain things that are going to ameliorate and correct the condition caused by those floods.

I say nature took care of the flood proposition in early times. We had forests. Snows would fall upon the forests, and they would not thaw until along some time in May or June. We had marshes to hold the waters like sponges, which gradually released them during the summer months. We had springs that were located in these forests that let the accumulated waters out gradually. So we had an even flow of water throughout the whole year; but now every improvement, every advance in civilization which has resulted in the cutting down of our forests, the draining of our swamp lands, and the straightening of our rivers, all lead to one thing, and that is to hurry the water off of our territory just as fast as we can get it off and to put it onto the territory of those below us. We are expending money and voting money for those things. Then when the floods come, because of the very thing happening that was bound to happen, we have to go into the other pocket to make good for our errors in the first instance. So it is costing us money coming and it is costing us money going. So the thing comes right down to this point, with me, at least, that I think before we go on expending any more hundreds of millions of dollars we ought to know in advance what we are going to do, what is our objective, and at what we are driving. For instance, the voting of \$45,000,000 for the purpose of building dikes or levees for flood protection amounts in the end to little if anything beneficial; that does not get us anywhere. The flood is a symptom of mismanagement in the handling of our waterways; it is a disease. It is a disease caused by a surplussage of energy which has been forced down into the rivers through our own unwise and thoughtless action. The very fact of the building of the Chicago Drainage Canal shows that we have not any well-defined ideas, because, as I have pointed out before, we are spending money to create a condition which creates the disease, and then we spend millions more to cure the disease of our own making.

So it is with the floods. They have floods down the Mississippi Valley, and it need not be a matter of surprise that those floods occur, for where else should the waters go if they could not go down the Mississippi Valley? Where do we expect those floods to go? The great volumes of water that are gathering throughout this immense territory have to find an outlet. They all head down to the same place, and, under present conditions, they can not go out in an orderly manner any more than you could cry fire in a crowded theater and expect all of the people to get out of the same door at the same time without a panic or without injury to life and limb. A flood is an absolutely inevitable consequence of the thing for which we are at least in part responsible. If we want to expend this money in this way, why not do it so as to bring important and good results at some time?

This is a matter in which I take a great deal of interest. I am not going to tire the Senate with talking about it again; but I do say that, if you want to cure the flood evil, all you have to do is to regulate the stream flow in every river and stream in that watershed, and then you will have the flood evil cured. Not only that, but then you will have permitted the waters to go out in an orderly manner and take their exit, in the way nature intended they should, to the sea, by providing an even flow of water; by making a beneficial use of something, that, unchecked, would be destructive; by providing in advance that this thing that is of such great value to us in the use of water power and irrigation and navigation be so treated as to conserve it and to save it, and by thus treating and conserving it take away a destructive power. We should make it our servant instead of our master. Then you will turn a murderous and destructive agency into something that is a factor for the upbuilding of wealth. It will be a wealth producer, and not a wealth destroyer, if you treat the question right; and, in order to treat it right, do not go down where these rivers overflow their banks and empty into the sea, but go up the streams and hold them where they belong, in a way which can be arranged absolutely and scientifically by a competent corps of engineers.

There is no question that this problem could be solved if this matter were placed in the hands of a competent body of engineers taken not only from the military, but from hydraulic and civil fields of activity—men who know their business as well as the men knew their business who constructed the Panama Canal. All you have to do is to find another colonel like the colonel who built the Panama Canal; let another Col. Goethals—or perhaps that great constructor himself—figure out some waterway scheme embracing the country from coast to coast and he will tell you just how much water has to go down through the several creeks and rivers and waterways of the country; he will tell you approximately just how many cubic feet of water have to force their way through the Mississippi River bottoms in a given time and at a certain time; and he will tell you how to check them and how to use them. He will tell you where to use them, where you should

put up your dams for storage reservoirs and for water-power purposes. He will tell you how to regulate them and how to regulate their stream flow so that when your system is perfect and built from above down—from the source of the stream down—in the course of time and with a minimum expenditure of money, if the matter is wisely administered, it will take care of every problem which we have in the way of rivers and harbors and waterways construction, in the way of irrigation, in the way of navigation, and, lastly, in the way of flood control, because you will stop the floods when you harness the waters and stop the waters from running away from you. There is not any question about that. It is a matter susceptible of easy regulation and at a minimum of expenditure; and I say that, if the thing is properly administered, it will pay for itself by way of returns that can be exacted from those given privileges to use this water to enrich themselves.

I feel that the way to go would be first to settle upon a plan and then to go ahead only with those things which are absolutely necessary, which we do not want to abandon, and which we can not abandon at this time. When the plan has been evolved by a corps of engineers, by men who know their business, it should be adopted and prosecuted to a conclusion. We legislators can not expect to know, and do not know, how this can be done, except in a general way; but if it can be shown—and I am sure it can be shown, as a matter of scientific demonstration—to be practicable, to be profitable and beneficial, by men who are making a study of this subject, then we can go ahead and spend our money in a wise way.

Suppose we had now \$850,000,000 to set out on a big, broad, comprehensive scheme to take care of our waterways and our harbors, we would at the time of completion of the whole system have money in the Treasury, besides having a completed waterway system. It is not a matter which can be built in a day or a year or, perhaps, in a score of years; but in the course of time we could have a system every angle and every element of which would be doing good and helping the country at large. All we have to do is to do it, in my humble judgment, by eliminating the present system and adopting a wise and proper plan.

My friend from Missouri a few minutes ago talked about building a house. I wonder what kind of houses we would have in this country if a lot of carpenters and masons set to work to build houses, without knowing what kind they were going to build and without a plan. We would have a fine hodge-podge proposition all over the country if we started to do that. I wonder what kind of railroads we would have in this country if every railroad went to work without consulting engineers, and started up in a haphazard hodge-podge way to build railroads all over the country, a mile here and a mile there. We have an illustration of that in the good-roads proposition, that ought to be corrected. In my State every county is building its own highways, and every town is determining where the road should be built for the money that comes to their town. In the course of time, if the money is expended, we will get something out of it, but anybody must know that, if a plan were arranged in advance, scientifically arranged in an orderly manner, with brains back of it and intelligence back of it, we would get \$5 for \$1 which we are expending now; and why should we not go ahead and do it?

It lies within our power here to do just as we want to do if we can get a majority to agree; and when a thing seems so perfectly obvious as this would appear to be, why not proceed in that way and conduct this kind of business in a proper manner?

I say we ought to stop, except as to those improvements which are absolutely necessary, and then we ought to look about and see what we can do in the way of getting some big, broad, comprehensive scheme to take care of all these questions either by way of a bureau or a department or perhaps through the instrumentalities which we have already established; but in some way that is dependent upon good reasons, scientific reasons, and not in part or in whole dependent upon this system, that "I will give you this if you will give me that," or "I will do this if you will do that," or "we will build this if you will build that"; not dependent upon anything that in particular benefits the whole country, but possibly benefiting only a few sections, where the representative people perhaps are zealous and want to get it for their appropriation; want to get an appropriation as a warrior of old wanted to get a scalp so he could wear it in his belt and boast about it.

We have our problems in Wisconsin, as I said at the outset. We would like to have our harbors improved as well as anybody else, but if there is any one of them which we can not show to Congress is important and worthy of the money being spent upon it I am not going to defend it, and I do not want to see it adopted. Neither do I want to see anything passed

that is going to put money into any other State unless it appears that not only the purpose of it, but the effect of it, is to give benefits to the country at large, or at least to a great portion of our inhabitants, commensurate with the moneys expended.

I feel as though this bill ought to be recommitted with instructions to the committee to report a bill out for what has heretofore been thought sufficient, namely, \$20,000,000, for the purpose of carrying on such projects as seem to be proper and most necessary. I have tried to show that even the best of these projects, so far as the appropriations relating to streams are concerned, do not appear to have brought in returns such as we have a right to expect and ought to expect from the investment of governmental funds. Yet there may be such; but I think enough has been shown, and it appears sufficiently clear from the facts adduced here, that Congress ought not to appropriate \$43,000,000 for things which at least, appear dubious and not deserving, and many of which are practically without merit. When so recommended, meritorious provisions may be brought forward and taken care of pending some sort of united action on the part of Congress to go at this matter in a scientific way. I think that if that is done something could be worked out here in the next two years. The present system has gone on for over a century in the old way; another year or two will not make so much difference; but the policy ought to be changed at once, and we ought to go at this thing in a different and, if I may be pardoned for saying so, in a more comprehensive way, with some idea of what it is going to lead to and where it is going to land us.

At the outset I made a statement that I was not here to oppose any of the particular projects; that I was here to try to discuss the system. This is not a system that ought to make Americans feel proud of their country or of their efficiency. I do not think a system of that kind is good enough for the United States; I do not think it reflects credit on the United States or makes anybody feel proud of it. I venture to say that the people of the United States, so far as I have any idea of their sentiment, favor a complete change of this system. It has been shown that our people are not afraid to appropriate money for some worthy cause, even though it costs a great deal. Not a grumble has been heard about the digging of the Panama Canal, and not a word of complaint has been heard about the additional expense occasioned by reason of certain cavings or slides, and that we have not yet got, because of that fact, the canal into its highest state of efficiency; but they have all backed the idea, without grumbling or without talking about the cost; they have all indorsed the idea of the Panama Canal, and they will indorse any kind of a proposition, no matter how much money it costs, if the ordinary man can be shown that for the dollar he has to produce from his pocket he is getting a dollar's worth of benefit somewhere in some way. He wants to feel that his affairs are being administered in a way that is going to bring benefit to the country and that it is not being thrown away or wasted.

When matters are discussed here about economy, we do not talk just the same as we do when we are talking about this question of raising the taxes from somebody.

I remember here when the water-power bills were up there was a proposition of raising some little revenue from the water-power privileges; but it was said "We will not need that money; the Nation does not want to exact tribute from its people." That is all very good, but you have to get your money somewhere, and if you do not get it from the fellow who is getting benefits from you you have to get it from the fellow who is not getting any benefits from you. If you are not going to tax the man who is being given special privileges, then you have to tax the man who is not being given special privileges. The Lord knows that a lot of men in this country when tax-paying time comes around are hard-set to get the money to pay their taxes; but after all they are good Americans, and the least grumbling comes from those who are least able to bear the tax. However, the average man likes to see at least one thing, and that is to see his money wisely expended. He would like to see the country of which he is a citizen administer his affairs for his benefit and the benefit of his fellow citizens, and even if the taxes are high, and even if he thinks sometimes that there is injustice he does not care really if he knows that back of the dollar he has had to contribute and which is being spent some good scheme is being pressed forward which is going to bring material returns in the way of benefits to all of the citizens of the country. That is what he would like to see in the expenditure of money on rivers and harbors. If you are going to tax him and going to take his money away from him he does not want you to toss it away on unworthy projects. He wants you and me and all of us to see that the money he has earned by the

sweat of his brow is invested in a way that is going to benefit him and his fellow citizens.

I do not honestly think that he will feel that the method under which \$850,000,000 of this money has been expended has been one that he can sanction or approve. He will never propose three cheers and wax enthusiastic over this proposition. I do not think that any Senator in this Chamber deep down in his heart thinks so himself. I have never heard anybody boast about the blessings secured from this expenditure. I have only heard them on the defensive, explaining, if not apologizing for, what has been done. I have never heard them parading around before the voters in campaigns the benefits and blessings which we have derived from river and harbor appropriations. One thing upon which all parties are agreed is that the least said about it the better. That is a fair test whether we ourselves think it is a good thing. We like to talk about the things that we think are beneficial, and the things that are not beneficial which we have no reason to be proud of we like to forget.

Applying that test or any other test, it seems to me that the expenditure of this money in this way any longer is beyond judgment or excuse, and therefore I move that the bill be recommitted to the committee with instructions to bring out a bill appropriating a sum not exceeding \$20,000,000.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HUSTING. I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wanted to ask the Senator if he did not think it would be better to withhold his motion to recommit until the efforts to perfect the bill have been completed? There are many Senators who feel somewhat as does the Senator from Wisconsin, but who are, however, very much in favor of a proper river and harbor bill, who believe that there are many items in this bill which should be passed; and who, if the bill could not be changed, would be inclined to vote with the Senator, but who would not do that at this time. I was wondering if his purpose would not be served as well by withholding his motion to recommit until the efforts to perfect this bill have been completed.

Mr. HUSTING. I will say to the Senator—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I take it that what the Senator wants is to have the bill recommitted. He certainly must recognize the fact that there will be a better opportunity to recommit it if it can not be amended so as to suit the ideas of Senators of what a proper bill should be than there is now, before all efforts to amend the bill have been exhausted.

Mr. HUSTING. I will say to the Senator that, of course, it is my hope and purpose that the bill may be recommitted. I am sure I do not know whether this is a proper time or not, but I am willing to adopt the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am going to vote for the Senator's suggestion if the present bill is not materially amended, and I know that there are several other Senators who feel as I do. I do not care to interfere with the Senator's plan as to what he wishes, but it seems to me that in behalf of an effort to get the best bill possible it might be better to withhold his motion until later along in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HUSTING. I will take the Senator's suggestion and will be glad to withhold the motion to recommit the bill until some time further on.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask that that motion be reduced to writing.

Mr. HUSTING. I thought I had it here, but I have not been able to find it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I now move to strike from the bill, on page 23, lines 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. What item is that?

Mr. KENYON. That is the Brazos River item. I think the Senator from Texas will be here in a moment.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Hitchcock	Norris	Smoot
Brandeggee	Hollis	O'Gorman	Sterling
Broussard	Hughes	Oliver	Stone
Catron	Husting	Owen	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Taggart
Clapp	Jones	Poindexter	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Ransdell	Tillman
Culberson	Lane	Reed	Townsend
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Underwood
Dillingham	Lewis	Sheppard	Vardaman
du Pont	Lippitt	Sherman	Wadsworth
Fall	Lodge	Simmons	
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about this amendment before it is voted on, if I can have the attention of the Senate. The amendment is to strike out on page 23 the words:

Continuing improvement from Old Washington to Waco by the construction of locks and dams heretofore authorized, \$200,000.

We voted yesterday for a survey of the Brazos River. The bill carries another survey. At a former session of Congress we voted for a resurvey and a reexamination of this project, the report of which has never been as yet presented to Congress. We are now called upon to vote \$200,000 on this Brazos proposition before the report of the engineers is received here and considered.

I wish to call attention to this proposition in a general way. We have appropriated somewhere around two and a half million dollars on the Brazos. There is no commerce that can be called commerce on the stream. The cost to the mouth is something like \$10,000,000. Two hundred thousand dollars was allotted under the act of 1914 and there was \$200,000 in the allotment of 1915.

The Brazos project is divided into two parts, from Velasco to Old Washington and from Old Washington to Waco. The former project carries in the bill for open-channel work \$15,000. I think probably there will be no objection made to that item. The commercial statistics as to that part of the stream should be very interesting.

On page 913 of volume 1 of the Engineer's Report for 1915 we find this interesting proposition:

Commercial statistics: No record of commerce could be obtained for 1914. The record for 1913 shows 1,080 short tons, valued at \$81,000. No record of commerce had been obtained for 1912. One boat makes weekly trips from Galveston to Columbia, but no record could be obtained.

We have spent on that part something like \$399,000. Then, on the part where the locks and dams are to be constructed we appropriated up to the end of the last fiscal year \$993,689.34. There was allotted under the act of 1914, \$200,000, and under the act of 1915 the allotment for the Army engineers was \$200,000, making a total of \$1,393,689.

That is the proposition that the last Congress decided should be resurveyed and reexamined, and that report has not as yet come to Congress. Is it not a fairly reasonable proposition now to wait until that report gets here?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Are we to understand that an appropriation is made in this bill for a project with reference to which a resurvey and a report and investigation have been ordered by Congress?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; and no report has yet been made. That need not shock the Senator.

Mr. NEWLANDS. On what theory, after Congress has determined that a matter shall be resurveyed and a reinvestigation made, is an actual appropriation made in this bill?

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator will explain to me the theory under which we have been voting propositions into this bill where reexaminations have been ordered and where the engineers had reported against the proposition, I might be able to explain this to him.

Mr. NEWLANDS. With reference to what proposition does the Senator speak?

Mr. KENYON. Arcadia, Mich., and the Arkansas River.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that the following projects are included:

Inland waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.
Coosa River, Ga. and Ala.
St. Lucia Inlet, Fla.
Brazos River, Tex., from Old Washington to Waco.
Red River, La., Ark., Tex., and Okla.
Ouachita River, Ark. and Okla.
Arkansas River, Ark.
Tennessee River, Tenn., Ala., and Ky.
Fox River, Wis.
Missouri River, Mo.

And there are a number of others.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from Utah—

Mr. KENYON. This project is to consist of eight locks and dams.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understood the Senator from Utah to refer to some river in Florida.

Mr. SMOOT. I did—St. Lucia Inlet, Fla. The engineers were instructed in the act of March, 1915, to make a resurvey of that inlet. I will say to the Senator—

Mr. FLETCHER. No; the appropriation was made and the Board of Engineers approved it. That is the work going on now. The resurvey proposition has not yet come up because it has not been acted upon by Congress, but the improvement of the river is based on the favorable report of the district engineer, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. SMOOT. In the act of March 4, 1915, section 15, it appears—

Mr. FLETCHER. That report has not yet been presented to Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what the Senator from Iowa says.

Mr. FLETCHER. That report does not exclude the improvement. It contemplates a more ambitious improvement of the project than ever before.

Mr. KENYON. They are all ambitious.

Mr. SMOOT. They are all that way. I am not disputing that at all. That is why the resurveys are made.

Mr. FLETCHER. The appropriation, the Senator will see, is not based on that. Nobody is asking that the action of Congress shall be based on that report, because it has not been made.

Mr. SMOOT. But the appropriations go right on.

Mr. FLETCHER. Where does the Senator see that in the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I simply stated in answer to the question asked of the Senator from Iowa, the rivers included in the request made of the engineers for resurveys, and among them was the St. Lucia Inlet, Fla. That is what I meant.

Mr. FLETCHER. The inquiry was directed as to projects in this bill that did not meet the approval of the Board of Engineers. There is no provision in the bill for St. Lucia Inlet at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator say that St. Lucia Inlet, Fla., is not a questionable project?

Mr. FLETCHER. I say there is no provision in this bill, and we will deal with that when we get to it. We are talking about a concrete proposition before the Senate, and St. Lucia Inlet is not in the bill. It makes no difference whether it is a meritorious project or not, we are not passing upon it.

Mr. KENYON. I think the Senator from Utah is out of order in claiming that there is any project that is questionable in the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Why not be reasonable about it? What is the use of discussing something that is not in the bill? We are talking about the bill that is before the Senate. There is no use in saying that the bill contains items that are unworthy, that have not been favored by the engineers at all, and then point to the St. Lucia Inlet as one of the items when it is not in the bill at all. That is the kind of argument we have been hearing all the way through this discussion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I inquire from the Senator from Iowa whether the St. Lucia Inlet, Fla., referred to, is a project for which appropriations have heretofore been made?

Mr. KENYON. I think there is no question of that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if continuing appropriations on the St. Lucia Inlet, Fla., should for the time being be abandoned in order to await the report upon the reexamination authorized by the last river and harbor act, why the same course has not been pursued with reference to all the items and all the projects with reference to which reexaminations were ordered? If the order of Congress that a reexamination should take place with reference to the Florida project has been made so effective as to exclude that project from the present appropriations, why should not the same rule be applied with reference to all other projects that were ordered to be reexamined by Congress, and why should the committee report to us appropriations upon such projects which were ordered to be reexamined?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am not entirely familiar with the history of the St. Lucia Inlet provision, but my recollection is that there has been no appropriation made to begin work there for the reason that the last two or three river and harbor bills failed. The pending bill was largely made up in the House of Representatives. Such items as were eligible to admission there under the theory of being old projects were included in it there. We did not go over the whole field to determine whether or not something that ought to be in the bill was left out, because we had before us projects amounting to about \$125,000,000, and we were compelled to select as between many meritorious proj-

ects in order to bring the bill within the limits of the possibility of the Government to provide for them. The Senator from Florida is more familiar with the situation at St. Lucia Inlet, and I am sure if the Senator from Iowa will permit him he will gladly state the position there.

Mr. KENYON. St. Lucia Inlet is not in this bill. I think we had better, perhaps, take up something that is in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice also that the Chief of Engineers reports that on July 1, 1914, there was an unexpended balance of \$99,927.08; that June 30, 1916, the amount expended during the fiscal year for the work of improvement was \$13.05; and that on July 1, 1915, there was an unexpended balance of \$99,414.03. That is the history of the financial summary as given by the Chief of Engineers in relation to St. Lucia Inlet, Fla.

Mr. FLETCHER. There was a project adopted for St. Lucia Inlet by Congress on the favorable report of the district engineer and the favorable report of the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers, and an appropriation of \$100,000 was made to begin that work. That was in 1913. The engineers were under the impression that a dredge could be built that would excavate the rock at the entrance without blasting. They thought that such a dredge could be brought from Panama, and there was some effort to do that. Gen. Goethals was on the stand, and testified before the Commerce Committee that there was a dredge at Panama which could take out this rock, which is not very hard rock. It is a coral formation under water and is hardened upon exposure. The engineers supposed that could be done, and for a long while they expected that they would get the dredge from Panama. But there were subsequent troubles, as Senators know, down there, and the material at Panama was needed there, so the dredge was not forthcoming.

That is the reason why, as the Senator has suggested, only some \$13 was spent of that money for a period of time covering one year. That was spent in calling for bids for the work. The bids were rejected because they were regarded as too high. The Government engineers thought they could do the work cheaper than they could get it done by contract, and they rejected the bids. Nothing was done, and so time has gone on, and no part of the appropriation has been used.

As the present contracts have been let, the work is going on, or will shortly be begun. Contracts have been entered into. When the Government found they could not get the dredge which they supposed they could use they made a contract at a figure which they believe is reasonable, much less than the former figures were. The contract is, as I said, actually closed, and the contractors are soon to begin work, if they have not already begun work within the last few days.

So there was no need for any reconsideration of the St. Lucia project, because there is enough money on hand to accomplish what had been authorized by Congress.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. KENYON. I do, if he will get through in a moment or two.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Florida whether the contract for the St. Lucia Inlet has been let since the time when Congress ordered a reexamination of the project?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it has.

Mr. NEWLANDS. March 4, 1915.

Mr. FLETCHER. They were authorized to go on under the original act and do that work.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Does not the Senator assume that Congress intended, with reference to the projects that were intended to be reexamined, that no such important step should be taken in the work as letting a contract until the report upon the reexamination was submitted to Congress?

Mr. FLETCHER. The engineers had full power and authority to proceed with the project, which had been approved by Congress. A reexamination might lead to the enlargement of the project or a change of the project to some extent.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Or perhaps to an abandonment?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; it could not possibly lead to an abandonment. I think nobody suggests that. There is need of that improvement there, and the question is as to the extent of it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The act itself says "with a view to their abandonment."

Mr. FLETCHER. It has never been recommended that it be abandoned by any board or any engineer.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator from Nevada, he will also find that a resurvey was ordered for Trinity River some years ago. It is going on now. The bill carries \$250,000 for Trinity River. The Senator will also find that the engineers just a few days ago reported against the James River proposi-

tion, that has been running for some 20 years, and is destined to run, probably, for all eternity. They reported against that just a few days ago. The bill carries \$190,000 for the James River.

But I want to get back to the Brazos. It is set forth on page 914 of the Engineers' Report that this project has not been adopted as a whole by Congress. We have gone along appropriating for different locks and dams in a scheme that requires eight locks and dams and 103 miles of open channel work, at an estimated cost of \$2,915,000. It seems strange that Congress should go ahead year by year and appropriate these large sums of money while the project as a whole, according to the Army engineers, has never been adopted.

I am not quite certain from these reports whether any of the locks and dams have been completed. They state on the same page that Lock No. 1 has been brought to 98 per cent of completion, and that Lock No. 8 was 75 per cent completed. A total of \$853,052.11 has been expended, of which \$441,564.63 was expended at Lock No. 1. Here is the statement about the commerce:

Commercial statistics: No freight is now carried on this section of the river, nor can be economically until the improvement is completed.

Of course the answer to that is, as it is to all these other projects, you can not have your commerce until the project is completed; but what I am insisting on is that a project of this character, involving millions, where Congress has ordered a resurvey and a reexamination, ought not to have another dollar appropriated until we get the result of that examination.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator how many projects which have been ordered to be reexamined by Congress are included within the appropriations made by this bill?

Mr. KENYON. I can not tell the Senator exactly. I think I am safe in saying that there are seven or eight. If the Senator had lent his genial presence to us yesterday and the day before he would have known that the Senate has voted in the bill projects that were condemned by the Army engineers under a reexamination ordered by Congress. While we can not do anything here, I hope that somewhere inquiries are going to be made of the Senators who have voted those things as to why it was done. Of course, the Senator knows we have had practically no attendance here, and there has been no attention given to the discussion of this bill. Senators rush in from the cloakrooms when the yeas and nays are taken and ask "What is the committee amendment?" or "What is it that we are to vote on?" I suppose that always will be true, but it has been especially true in the consideration of this bill. I kept an account one day when we were discussing the East River project, New York, of the attendance. At 25 minutes after 1 there were 7 Republicans in the Chamber and 12 Democrats. At 45 minutes after 1 there were 11 Republicans and 12 Democrats. The Democrats seem to have done better than the Republicans.

Mr. GALLINGER. There are more of them.

Mr. KENYON. At 5 minutes after 2 there were 11 Republicans and 14 Democrats in the Chamber. At 25 minutes after 2 there were 11 Republicans and 12 Democrats. At 45 minutes after 2 there were 14 Republicans and 10 Democrats, the only time when the Republicans had more here than the Democrats.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator whether it was the same 11 who were here or was that the average?

Mr. KENYON. I think perhaps some went to lunch; I do not know where the others went. It simply illustrates the kind of consideration that has been given to this bill.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator will bear witness to the fact that I have been here all the time.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Arkansas has been here every moment.

Mr. President, I think I have said all I want to say about the Brazos River. If the Senate wants to vote these kind of matters into the bill, of course that is its privilege.

Mr. THOMAS. Before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him a question. The Senator said, if I understood him correctly, that the bill carries an item for James River, Va., for a project which has been condemned by the Army engineers. Does the Senator refer to the item at the top of page 12?

James River, Va.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$190,000.

Mr. KENYON. I referred to that item. I want to qualify what I said in this way: The project calls for many millions of dollars. It is a project, I think, for a 22-foot depth. The Army engineers report against that. I have here the advance sheets of their report.

Mr. THOMAS. When was that report made?

Mr. KENYON. That report was made the 13th day of May.

Mr. THOMAS. Since this bill came over from the House?

Mr. KENYON. Since we have been discussing it. They report in favor of an 18-foot depth to the river and a turning basin at Richmond to cost \$450,000, and recommend that that appropriation be divided into two parts, that they be made two annual appropriations; \$190,000 is provided for here and \$190,000 is appropriated on the theory of the old plan.

Mr. THOMAS. With the abandonment of the old project?

Mr. KENYON. The modification.

Mr. THOMAS. A modified project?

Mr. KENYON. A modification of the project from 22 feet to 18 feet. The district officer says it can be completed for \$2,588,636.79. They have there an 18-foot channel and they recommend abandoning that project in favor of simply constructing a turning basin to cost \$450,000 and maintaining the river at 18 feet. I think we will hear more about that river before we are through with the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I will content myself by waiting until the subject comes directly before the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. I shall not raise any more question about it, but I imagine the Senators from Virginia will.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask one other question, then. Assuming that the bill passes in its present form and the \$190,000 appropriation becomes effective and is expended upon the prevailing project, what effect will that have upon the recommendations last made by the Board of Engineers?

Mr. KENYON. I assume it will be that much money wasted, because it goes on the old project and will not be used for what the engineers recommend.

Mr. THOMAS. So, notwithstanding the present recommendation, if this item becomes a law it will be expended upon the existing project, and then we will have to spend just as much more upon the new project as though this appropriation had failed?

Mr. KENYON. Unless the bill is changed and the \$190,000 provided for is to be used for the turning basin.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. A moment ago the Senator from Iowa said there were seven or eight projects provided for in the bill on which resurveys had been ordered. Can the Senator state what would be the cost of those projects which are provided for in the bill?

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator mean the amount of money that is carried in the bill for those projects?

Mr. POMERENE. The amount of money that is carried in the bill for those seven or eight projects.

Mr. KENYON. No; I can not. There is \$250,000 carried for the Trinity; \$200,000 for the Brazos; \$25,000 for Arcadia.

Mr. SMOOT. How much for the Missouri?

Mr. KENYON. The Missouri was condemned by only two of the engineers. There is a million and a half carried for the Missouri which is condemned by the district engineer and the division engineer but not by the Board of Engineers. Then there is the Arkansas River.

Mr. POMERENE. What is the amount for the Missouri?

Mr. KENYON. A million and a half. For the Arkansas River I think the appropriation is \$234,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the Senator from Ohio will allow me, I will say to the Senator from Iowa—

Mr. POMERENE. I will be very glad to allow the Senator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No resurvey of the Trinity River was ordered in the last river and harbor act, and the instrumental survey now in progress on the Trinity was not ordered with a view to determine whether the project should be retained or abandoned, but in order to determine exactly how many locks and dams would be required under the existing project.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator say that under the last act or the previous act there was not a resurvey or reexamination of the Brazos ordered?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am referring to the Trinity.

Mr. KENYON. Oh.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator said a resurvey had been ordered of the Trinity to determine whether the project should be retained or abandoned.

Mr. KENYON. I did not say, however, that a resurvey had been ordered of the Trinity in the last act. I knew that that was not so. It was ordered some years ago and a survey is now in progress of the Trinity. Is not that true?

Mr. SHEPPARD. But it is an instrumental survey to determine the exact number of locks and dams necessary for the project. This resurvey was not ordered for the purpose of determining whether the project should be continued or discontinued.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator may be correct; I do not know. He knows more about the Trinity than I do.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Iowa also made the further statement that there are other projects provided in the bill which have been rejected by the Board of Engineers. Can the Senator state what would be the cost of those items?

Mr. KENYON. As to the Arkansas River, to which the Senate added another \$25,000, I can give the Senator the exact figures. The amount is \$234,700, where the engineers recommended \$85,000. Then there is the Wichita, on which I expect to show a little later the Army engineers recommended \$234,000 and the bill carries \$470,000. That is one of the projects resurveyed. The Arcadia, which is the proposition of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], carries \$25,000, a small amount. That was condemned by the Army engineers and it is placed in the bill by a committee amendment.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say about the Brazos River.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, this discussion simply illustrates how hopeless the present system of conducting river development is. We find it universally admitted that although the United States Government has been employed for over a hundred years in working upon our rivers river commerce has steadily declined; that on the whole the rivers are not so well adapted to navigation as they once were.

Now, where does the fault lie? Does it lie with the Board of Engineers who are charged with the work of developing these rivers? Does it lie with Congress, or does it lie with and is it inherent in the general system, or rather no system, that exists for comprehensive river development? Has Congress been at fault? What general legislation has it ever adopted with a view to the complete regulation of our rivers as instrumentalities of commerce? Have we ever proposed or adopted with reference to river development and regulation such a full and comprehensive measure as we adopted for the commencement and the completion of the Panama Canal? Have we ever proposed or adopted such a full and complete system of legislation as we adopted with reference to irrigation and reclamation of arid lands in 17 States?

Have the engineers been incompetent or has Congress been incompetent? The engineers demonstrated their competency in the completion of the Panama Canal, costing over \$400,000,000. The engineers have demonstrated their capacity in 23 irrigation projects in 17 States, costing nearly \$80,000,000, and embracing problems in engineering and in hydraulics far surpassing in difficulty those attendant upon the building of the Panama Canal. Almost all of those projects have been completed within a period of 12 years.

Here we have, then, a competent Engineer Corps of the Army, their competency demonstrated at Panama, and a competent corps of civil engineers in the Reclamation Service whose competency has been demonstrated in 23 projects either finished or nearing completion within a period of 12 years.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I should like to suggest a word rather than to be foreclosed by the statement the Senator just made in reference to some matters that may subsequently arise as to irrigation projects. I shall say no more to the Senator than that, while the greatest possible intelligence has been shown by the engineers, some very grave mistakes have been made by them. Rather than to let it go as an absolute piece of certainty without a reservation in the Record, I wish to accompany the Senator's remarks with the statement that there have been grave mistakes made, and they naturally would be made in any enterprise as large as that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes, Mr. President, mistakes have been made, and mistakes always are made in great works. A mistake was made in the original estimate of the cost of the Panama Canal. It was estimated at \$150,000,000, the actual completion costing more than \$400,000,000. Mistakes were made in the estimates regarding the irrigation works; estimates largely increased by the unprecedented rise within the period of 10 years of the cost of labor and of supplies. But the fact remains that these great monumental works have been undertaken and have been completed within a period of 12 years. So I say the fault does not lie with the engineers. Where does it lie?

Oh, you may say commerce has declined upon these rivers because the railroads have taken the place of the rivers as instrumentalities of commerce. Yes, they have taken the place, but how has that place been taken? By the cruel and brutal competition of the rail carriers with the water carriers, which resulted in the destruction of the latter, and Congress has been impotent to stay the ruthless hand of the rail carriers.

Is river regulation and river navigation a failure elsewhere in the civilized world? Is not river transportation employed side by side with rail transportation in every civilized country

in the world that has rivers? Can you point me to one that has not fully developed its rivers or is not now engaged in the work of developing its rivers? Their work is not to reclaim swamp lands but to promote commerce.

We have Germany, we have France, we have Austria, we have Russia, all of which countries either have developed or are in the work of developing their rivers to their full capacity for transportation, even going to the extreme of connecting those rivers at their headwaters and at other places with each other in such a way that they have a perfect network of waterways, consisting of natural and artificial waterways, just as complete a network as the railways themselves. There it is well understood that the rivers are to be used for cheap and bulky products, far exceeding in tonnage the valuable products, and whose cheap transportation is absolutely essential to cheap living among the people and to cheap production and manufacture everywhere.

In this country the railroads, eager to absorb the entire tonnage, have upon these products received rates that are hardly compensatory, because the products will not stand high rates of transportation, and we are constantly increasing the capitalization of the railways of the country to meet the demand of bulky transportation, which could be much more economically made by the cheaper development of our rivers for transportation. But in all those foreign and highly civilized countries we find the water carrier coordinating with the rail carrier and not sandbagged by the rail carrier, and both of them coordinating with the ocean carriers in the development of a scientific system of transportation. If the development of our rivers has failed, why has it failed? Because our engineers are incompetent? No; because Congress has been incompetent.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator, for my information, name a single inland waterway in the United States that carries any commerce of any consequence at this time?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know of any except perhaps the Ohio; and this reduction of water-borne commerce has been the result of the system which has been pursued by Congress. What has that system been? The system of individual initiative by Members of Congress, under which an individual Senator or an individual Representative presents a measure that relates to his particular locality, and which has the virtue perhaps of aiding commerce in some degree, but in a very large degree of expending money in the locality from which the Representative hails.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I inquire, then, whether this whole river and harbor bill is not in fact what Hancock said the tariff was, a local issue?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, it looks so; and we find Members of the House and of the Senate seeking positions upon committees having jurisdiction of this subject, not so much with a view of building up a great comprehensive, useful system, which will embrace the development of the commerce of the country, but with a view to the benefit of a particular section or locality which they represent; and then the temptation is presented of a union of support in favor of individual projects, otherwise indefensible, with a view of carrying them all through in the pending bill.

And how was this system further strengthened? The engineers were useful, it is true. Upon them Congress relied for the ultimate work. But instead of giving the engineers a free hand and enabling them to report their suggestions with reference to full and comprehensive legislation upon this subject Congress in its very river and harbor bills put shackles upon its engineers, put them in chains, and forbade them to make a suggestion beyond the proposal made to them by the initiative of an individual Congressman, approved by Congress. You will find in two or three cases in the legislation of Congress, as it progressed, an absolute instruction and a veto upon the action of the engineers with reference to any suggestion beyond the matter in hand. The engineers have never yet been called upon to present a full and comprehensive scheme for the development of our rivers as instrumentalities of commerce.

I do not know how many hundred millions have been spent, and yet commerce has declined; and what remedy is now proposed by the action of the House of Representatives? The organization of a Committee on Flood Control; not the organization of a committee to create navigable rivers, not the organi-

zation of a committee to promote commerce, but to control floods; and those floods, according to its action, are to be controlled only upon the lower reaches of the Mississippi River. They invite the waters in this vast watershed, embracing one-half of the United States, to flow down to them without embarrassment or obstruction. They say to us, "Hurry them on; drain your lands; reclaim your swamp lands; let all the waters hurry down to the lower Mississippi River, and then we will take care of them." And how do they propose to take care of them?

By building levees mountain high on either side of the Mississippi River in order to prevent the overflow. And when we suggest that a policy may be pursued in the upper reaches of these rivers, in the great intermountain region which is the source of many rivers, in the Great Lakes region, in the great regions of the Ohio and the Tennessee and the Cumberland and the upper Mississippi, that developments may be made there by which the flow of the water may be so obstructed as to prolong the length of the high-water season below, so that its flood height will be only one-half of the accustomed height, we are told that we are visionary; that nothing should be done in the way of obstructing or slowing up the progress of these waters; that nothing should be done in the shape of turning these waters into a national asset, into creators of wealth; but we should permit them to mass together for destruction below; and then a cry of distress comes up from our southern friends: "The waters coming from your region are destroying us. Give us \$6,000,000 a year with which to put up mountains on each side of this great river to prevent these waters from overflowing our lands and from destroying our cities." And when we tell them that there are four departments of the Government that are engaged in the great work of water conservation and water study—the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture, in addition to the Department of War—and that each one of these departments has two or three scientific services that are engaged not only in studies, in scientific research with reference to this matter, but in actual engineering work, and that these departments ought to be brought into coordination with the War Department in plans and in works, the reply is made to us: "No; we prefer that this entire work shall remain as it has been, in the hands of but one of these departments—the War Department—and that the engineers of the Army shall alone attend to this work," without the aid of the accumulated experience and knowledge of these scientific services, many of which for over 50 years have been serving their country faithfully and well, not only in the matter of research but in the matter of actual engineering work.

I have no words of criticism for the Engineer Corps of the Army. There is nothing that can be said in commendation of the integrity of that corps which I would not indorse; but I have the same words of commendation with reference to the integrity and the efficiency of the engineering corps of the Reclamation Service, composed of civil engineers. I assert without fear of contradiction that that engineer corps has solved more difficult problems with reference to hydraulics than have ever been considered by the Engineer Corps of the Army; and yet our southern friends say that these men shall not be brought into collaboration; that you will drain the whole Union for money with which to take care of the floods in the southern reaches of this river, and you will not apply a dollar to the obstruction of these waters on their way to the lower flood reaches of the river and the application of these waters to beneficial purposes, such as making the arid lands blossom, such as the creation of water power, the development of electrical energy—entering more vitally into the lives of our people than any other agency, advancing their comfort and their convenience and diminishing their physical effort—the restoration of our forests, where vast masses of trees will drink up this moisture which otherwise would go into the streams and rivers, and develop it into fiber useful to man; and, above all, or equally with these other uses, involving the scientific control of water in such a way as to promote the reclamation and use of swamp lands as well; so that all of these uses and controls of water, creating wealth, can be developed by the very method employed for slowing up the progress of these waters falling from the heavens on the various watersheds of the country from their sources to the gulfs and oceans.

We have in the West 17 arid and semiarid States, with 34 votes in this body—States which occupy for the most part the elevated region of the country, where men have vision, where there are men who can see things beyond the boundaries of their own States, and who are capable of conceiving of great engineering works that will benefit not only them but the entire country. Are we going to participate longer in the piecemeal legislation which has thus far characterized Congress? Are we

going to encourage the committees which have fallen into bad habits of division of projects and silence, which are intent upon what has been designated by the country as a spoils system? Or are we going to give a committee jurisdiction of this subject whose very name indicates its purpose?

What was the basis for the proposition upon which the Interstate Commerce Committee was organized? It was the promotion of interstate commerce. Prior to that time, the Commerce Committee of the Senate was the only committee on commerce having jurisdiction both of foreign and of interstate commerce. What did the Senate mean when it created the Committee on Interstate Commerce? Why, it meant that it intended to segregate that entire subject from the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee, and give it to the new committee.

What has that new committee done? Why, it advanced gradually and progressively toward complete jurisdiction of the subject, and wisely so. The first question which it took up was the question of rail transportation, for that was the vital question of the time—the regulation of these giant carriers that had constructed a network of rails over the entire country, and were controlling political organizations and legislatures and administrative officers. After a long struggle, as the result of the recommendations of that committee, legislation was enacted under which public regulation was developed, and it is now about to enter upon an inquiry which embraces not only the perfection of that regulation but the study of a possible Government ownership.

Then it took up the question of the control of telegraph companies, and then of express companies, and then of oil carriers; and now it finds before it the vital question of the development of our water transportation, the promotion of water carriage, and its regulation and control in such a way as to protect it from the rail carriers, who have been the destroyers of the water carriers, and the development of both as coordinate instrumentalities for the service of the public.

Mr. President, the traditions of the committees of the House and the Senate—the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate—are such as to give no indication that they will take up this question in a full and comprehensive way, and it does not fall within their jurisdiction. That jurisdiction has been exercised there by sufferance and not as a matter of right; and yet, when we seek to have bills for the regulation of commerce between the States by the instrumentality of water carriers referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee, whose jurisdiction upon those subjects is a matter of right, we are met by the objection that the practice has been to the contrary, and that as a matter of tradition the Commerce Committee has control of this subject.

Mr. President, I have talked with individual members of the Commerce Committee, which is composed of men of the highest distinction and the highest character in this body. I know how individuals on that committee have felt with reference to the lameness and the impotency of this development. They are embarrassed by the practices of the past, by the traditions of the past. They are embarrassed by the necessity of immediate action with reference to the localities which they represent; and it is much easier to pursue the beaten path of legislation than to indulge in revolution which may temporarily disturb the progress essential in their judgment to the prosperity of the communities which they represent.

I make no attack on that committee or its membership. I was once a member of that committee myself. I sat upon it for several years. My purpose in going upon the committee was to secure the consideration of some big measure that would correct the practices of the past. I found that committee so overloaded with work—not simply with work relating to the river and harbor bill, but with work relating to other departments and bureaus of the Government—that they had not the time to take up such a consideration; and whilst I was persistent and insistent I could never get patient consideration for a broad and comprehensive measure. So, having failed there, I went off the committee; and ever since I have been off the committee I have been pressing this matter upon the floor, in the hope that I could arrive at some accommodation. I have even gone so far as to suggest that we should organize a new committee in the Senate as they organized it in the House—a committee of 15, of which one-third should be taken from the Committee on Commerce, one-third from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and one-third from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands. I have not been able to make any headway with that proposal. Such a committee would not resemble the committee that has been organized in another body, whose jurisdiction seems to be only over flood control and whose jurisdiction seems to be exercised simply in taking care of the floods after they have

been massed, instead of preventing them from massing. It would be a committee composed of experienced men on all three of these committees, embracing Senators representing every section of the country, with a view to framing not simply a measure for the flood control of the lower reaches of the rivers but with a view to controlling those waters from the time they fall from the heavens upon the earth, God's benefaction to men, and putting every drop of that water to beneficial use before it finally mingles with the waters of the ocean.

Whilst this bill has progressed I have not been disposed to intrude my views very much regarding it. For instance, I did not know until to-day that this bill embraced seven or eight projects with reference to which Congress at the last session, during the consideration of the last river and harbor bill, ordered a reexamination to be made. Why did Congress order that reexamination? Because it had doubts as to the feasibility and value of the projects. Does not good faith require that Congress should wait until these examinations and reports are made to Congress, so that it can form its judgment? Yet these appropriations are placed in this bill, doubtless as the result of the settled convictions of the Senators or Representatives representing the districts to which they belong of their feasibility and their value; but the judgment of Congress was that their feasibility and value was in such doubt as to require a reexamination, and these reports have not been made. How are the items in this bill? They are in this bill as a part of this very system which I criticize, whereby, in order to get the support of all the members of the committee for a bill and to present an undivided front either in the House or in the Senate, it is necessary to include measures concerning which there is doubt, but concerning which certain members of that committee have no doubt. So they are included, and thus the judgment of two or three or four or five or six men backing these projects, which have been declared by Congress to be of doubtful value, is forced upon the judgment of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and we are called upon either to defeat the entire bill or to let these appropriations go through.

I wish to say that, with reference to the flood-control bills coming from the House of Representatives, I claim that there has been—I will not go so far as to say a lack of good faith, but I do claim that there has been a lack of consideration. The city of New Orleans was in danger, was fearing another flood. The Reclamation Association of New Orleans and the Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans have declared in favor of a bill which I have been urging for years, known as the Newlands-Broussard river-regulation bill, differing in their judgment, perhaps, from the rest of the lower Mississippi Valley, the people of which seem attached to the present system of river development and river appropriation.

The city of New Orleans, as the result of that system of inviting the waters of this great watershed to rush down the Mississippi River, by the very doors of New Orleans, has seen the flood level constantly rising in height and threatening the destruction of the city, and so the people of that city have been compelled to build their levees higher and stronger. The entire city may yet, at some time, be the victim of some failure of or defect in its levee system through a crevasse or otherwise. So, being apprehensive, as they saw the policy being carried out of building these levees higher and higher in order to prevent the waters from going over their accustomed area of overflow and thereby lowering the height of the flood below, observing that their flood level was constantly increasing in height, they sent a telegram to the Secretary of Commerce calling attention to this important question. That communication was laid before the Cabinet, and as a result of that the interdepartmental committee of Cabinet officers, appointed three years ago to consider this river-regulation bill, as a result three-fourths of them declaring in favor of it and the other one-fourth, the Secretary of War, not opposed to it but not enthusiastic about it, that interdepartmental Cabinet committee was called together, and what did they do? The first thing they did was to send for those who were responsible for the Newlands-Broussard bill and for the Ransdell-Humphreys bill, assuming that these two bills covered all the proposals that could be made upon the subject. As a result of this inquiry, these gentlemen, this Cabinet committee, made a unanimous report to the President, recommending substantially the organization which has been urged by the bill which bears my name. They recommended coordination of services by the appointment of a departmental council, consisting of the Secretaries of War, of the Interior, of Commerce, and of Agriculture, with the President at its head, and authorizing that commission to bring the various services into coordination, and providing the other machinery for full and comprehensive consideration of all the problems that relate to water, including cooperation with the States.

It was supposed, inasmuch as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] assented to those recommendations, his assent would carry the support of his associate in that bill, Mr. HUMPHREYS, of the House, but it did not.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL. I should like to ask the Senator if, when he invited me to that conference, I did not insist that he wait until Mr. HUMPHREYS returned?

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator did.

Mr. RANDELL. And told him that I had no authority to speak for Mr. HUMPHREYS?

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is right.

Mr. RANDELL. Then, why does the Senator try to insist on my binding Mr. HUMPHREYS? He has done that about three or four times on this floor. I told the Senator that I could not bind Mr. HUMPHREYS; that I could not bind the other House; that I was willing to stand by what the interdepartmental conference did; and I urged Mr. HUMPHREYS and several of his most influential associates to create some kind of commission which would carry out the ideas of the Senator from Nevada; but they refused to do it. I am willing now—and I said so the other day on this floor—to create a commission to work out some kind of control of the waters from the time they fall from the clouds until they get into the ocean.

I can not control this matter, however. I have presented the interdepartmental plan for a national waterways commission to a number of Senators, asking them if they would stand for such a commission; and I have not found one who would agree to anything of the kind. I am tired of having my name brought in so often, I will say to the Senator, in connection with this by innuendo or otherwise. I want the Senator to confine himself absolutely to a plain statement of the actual facts of the case. I tried to get Mr. HUMPHREYS there; I tried to get the Senator to wait until he came, but he would not do it.

The Senator insisted on holding the conference, and at the meeting I said that I had no objection to the general plan which the departmental committee desired. I am willing to have it, so far as I am concerned. I am so anxious to get legislation for the lower Mississippi that if Congress will legislate for it and relieve my people from the awful suffering and sorrow that they have had to undergo from the waters of 31 States since the beginning of this Republic, I shall make no objection to investigating other projects; but I insist on this, and this alone: That no money be appropriated for anything until it has been thoroughly and carefully investigated and reports thereon have been made to Congress. The Senator will remember that I said that, and I am willing now to have a commission created that will study water for the purposes of irrigation and navigation, porosity and absorbent qualities of the soil, about which the Senator is so anxious, drainage, flood control, and every use of water; but I do not think that it really would be quite dignified to ask the President of the United States and four of his Cabinet officers to form such a commission.

It seems to me that, if we wish to get something practical, we should create a commission of seven or nine of the ablest men in the United States, of the ablest engineers, men of the caliber, for instance, of George W. Goethals, the Panama Canal builder. We might create a commission of that kind and put Goethals or some other able man like him at its head, and say to them, "Gentlemen, we are not altogether satisfied with the present system of spending money on drainage, navigation, irrigation, flood control, the use of water in connection with forestry, and all the uses of water. Work out something better if you can, gentlemen of this commission, and submit it to us, and let us see if we can devise wiser methods than those now in use." I have no objection to that kind of a commission. I have said that here; I said it to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] first, and then I said it to many others. I am entirely willing to have that kind of commission, but I do not wish to be placed in a false position, and I do not think the Senator from Nevada means to misrepresent me; I hope he does not; but I am bound to state exactly what happened at that meeting and to set myself right.

I had no power to control the other House, but I did confer with Mr. HUMPHREYS and some of his associates and try to get them to have a much broader commission than their bill provides. I discussed all these questions with Mr. HUMPHREYS, Dr. FOSTER, and Mr. R. J. WILSON, and they will tell the Senator so. I urged that on them strongly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the views of the Senator from Louisiana, though they have been expressed with unnecessary heat. I am glad also to know that he

favors substantially the recommendation by this departmental commission.

I did not misrepresent the Senator from Louisiana. I stated the facts—the fact that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], and myself consulted with this Cabinet committee, and that it was assumed by us that his colleague in the Ransdell-Humphreys bill would follow those recommendations. That assumption proved to be incorrect; but the statement that the assumption existed and it was incorrect is no reflection upon the Senator from Louisiana.

I wish, however, to state that I have now learned for the first time that the Senator from Louisiana is prepared to accept the recommendations of this Cabinet committee; I mean for the first time recently, but since the bill was introduced and reported by the Flood Control Committee of the other House, I assumed that the Senator from Louisiana had practically abandoned that recommendation, for I understood—and in that I may be inaccurate—that the Senator from Louisiana introduced in the Senate the same bill that was introduced by Mr. HUMPHREYS in the other House. Is not that correct?

Mr. RANDELL. I did so because I believed it was the very best that we could get.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I assume from that that the Senator was disposed to support that bill, and I am opposed to that bill.

Mr. RANDELL. I am disposed to support the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am going to fight against that bill because of the abandonment of the most essential recommendations of this cabinet committee, which is a coordination of the various scientific services of the country in this great work of comprehensive river development, the basic thing upon which the other sections of the country rely. I am willing to give Louisiana the money; but what I insist upon is that the bill that carries the money should also carry the organization that will be of advantage to sections of the country other than the lower reaches of this river. I am more intent upon a perfected organization that will give us a perfect plan than I am upon immediate appropriations. I am perfectly willing to sacrifice any appropriations called for by the bill which I have supported, and am perfectly willing to give the South the appropriations that they insist upon; but their policy seems to be to insist that we should shove the waters continually down upon them so that they levee against them, and spend money in leveeing against them, whilst we say we want to retain these waters within our own boundaries as the sources of untold wealth. That bill unfortunately—

Mr. RANDELL. Will the Senator permit a brief interruption?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL. I want to ask the Senator if he recalls that in March, 1909, a National Waterways Commission was created by act of Congress, with the following membership: Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, chairman; Jacob H. Gallinger, of New Hampshire, vice chairman; Samuel H. Piles, of Washington; William Alden Smith, of Michigan; F. M. Simmons, of North Carolina; James P. Clarke, of Arkansas; and William Lorimer, of Illinois, on the part of the Senate; and on the part of the House, D. S. Alexander, of New York; Frederick C. Stevens, of Minnesota; Irving P. Wanger, of Pennsylvania; Stephen M. Sparkman, of Florida; and John A. Moon, of Tennessee?

That commission made a report in March, 1912, which shows that they had examined the waterways practically all over this country and Europe. I shall not take the time of the Senate by reading it. But on page 65 of their final report they say that they thoroughly examined the Mississippi River from St. Paul to New Orleans, that they had inspected the Missouri River from Kansas City to its mouth and the Illinois River from the lower portion to the head of navigation. They had the assistance of a great many very able engineers and experts. I desire to read merely a brief sentence from the report, as follows:

Numerous propositions have been made for the creation of a board of public works or other body which shall decide upon the feasibility and desirability of propositions for expenditures on rivers and harbors. The commission is unwilling to recommend a change of this kind, and points to the fact that the past recommendations of the Engineer Corps have been carefully prepared and with a degree of expert knowledge and comprehension of the commercial needs of the country which could not well be supplied by any other body or organization. The advantages which attach to the Engineer Corps are obvious. The members are in the permanent service of the Government and are free from those influences which would inevitably be brought to bear upon men in civil life. Those engineers now engaged in the work are carefully trained in the planning and execution of these improvements and have special qualifications for judging the feasibility and the cost of proposed river and harbor projects. They also have a good general knowledge on the

probable commercial results which would accrue, though on this point their opinions have not been regarded as conclusive.

That commission was created for the purpose of investigating questions pertaining to water transportation and the improvement of waterways and to make recommendations to Congress. It was certainly composed of a number of the very ablest men in the Congress at that time, and it recommended leaving waterway matters in the hands of Congress and the Engineer Corps of the Army. I do not know that we can act in any wiser way than that, though, as I have said, I am willing to have another commission created to make a study similar to that made by the National Waterways Commission and with enlarged powers, as I have indicated, to see if any better plans can be worked out.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I want to say that, whilst I was a member of that commission, I was not able to devote any attention to its work.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I will state that that commission, called the National Waterways Commission, was organized some two or three years after the Inland Waterways Commission had made its report. Mr. Burton was the chairman of both of those commissions. The National Waterways Commission, the last one appointed, was composed entirely of Members of the Senate and of the House, selected from the Commerce Committee of the Senate and from the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the other body. Those committees were practically wedded to the system which has existed so long. The Inland Waterways Commission was a commission appointed by President Roosevelt and composed of two Senators, two Representatives, and the chiefs of the various scientific services, including the Chief of Engineers of the Army, the Chief of the Reclamation Service, the Chief of the Forestry Service, the Chief of the Geological Survey, and some others.

That first commission, the Inland Waterways Commission, after a thorough survey of the entire subject, visiting every part of the country, made a report recommending practically the organization covered by the bill which I had the honor to introduce and the organization recommended by the present Cabinet committee. Mr. Burton signed that report as the chairman of that commission.

Now, I wish to say that, whilst Mr. Burton knew more about the waterways and the harbors of this country than anybody else, Mr. Burton was never an active advocate of the development of our rivers. Instead of being the engine that propelled this movement he was always the brake upon the movement. Brakes, as well as engines, have their use. So far as I am concerned I prefer to belong to the motive power rather than to the braking and obstructing power. But you can review Mr. Burton's entire connection with the river development of this country, and you will not find that driving energy, that faith and confidence that are essential to carry through a great movement; but throughout, so far as river regulation is concerned, Mr. Burton has been an obstructor, a brake upon the movement, rather than a motive power.

I make no reflection upon Mr. Burton when I state that. He will probably state that to be his own position. He signed the Inland Waterways Commission report, however, providing practically for the very organization for which I am now contending.

Why was that second commission organized? I asserted at the time that that commission was organized because it was felt by the opponents of river development, of real, genuine river development, that the recommendations of the Inland Waterways Commission, urged by Mr. Roosevelt and urged by Mr. Taft in a report when Secretary of War, were about to ripen into legislation, and so the expedient was resorted to of getting a new investigating commission.

I protested against it at the time. I wanted no more investigations; I wanted work; and I wanted a commission organized to commence work and not simply to study the subject; and that commission was not organized in such a way as to develop a vital energy in this movement.

So I expected that a commission composed entirely of members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the other House and of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, who had been accustomed for years to regard the Engineer Corps of the Army with the highest confidence and esteem, and to question whether there was wisdom anywhere else than in that corps—I expected that they would make a report practically insisting that the work should continue as heretofore, entirely under the control of the Engineer Corps.

Recollect, that I do not propose to deprive the Engineer Corps of one iota of jurisdiction which they have had in the past. I simply propose to add to their knowledge and their information and their work the knowledge and the information and the work of other scientific services of the Government;

but I regret to say that the Engineer Corps of the Army, exclusive, as it always has been, by reason of its military organization, does not look with favor upon a cooperation or coordination of powers; and that is the one criticism that I have to address to that corps. I have no hostility to that corps; on the contrary, the great bulk of the work done under this proposed new system of organization will be done by the Engineer Corps of the Army, and their work will be enlarged instead of diminished; but it seems perfectly obvious that when different forces and boards and bureaus and services are at work upon the elusive waters of these great river systems—in Montana to-day, in Missouri to-morrow, and in the Gulf of Mexico the day after that—the cooperating, coordinating powers of all these services should be employed by the Government, not only in plans but also in work.

So, as against Mr. Burton as chairman of the National Waterways Commission, composed simply of members of the Commerce Committee of the Senate and of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the other body, I appeal to the judgment of Mr. Burton, as chairman of the Inland Waterways Commission, composed not only of Senators and Representatives, but of the chiefs of the scientific services of the Government, and by reason of that fact, it seems to me, taking a broader view of the subject.

If you will refer to the report of the Inland Waterways Commission, you will find that that commission regards as essential the coordination of these scientific services, the cooperation of the Nation with the States in the proper and proportionate development of the rivers of the country.

Mr. President, I will say that I do not think the members of the Commerce Committee of the Senate and of the Rivers and Harbors Committee in the other House are quite satisfied as individuals with the system which has been pursued; but they find themselves under the restraint of yielding their individual opinions here and there in order to get what they need, or what they think they need, for their constituencies. It seems to me, therefore, that the Senate of the United States might well turn over this subject matter of the development of our rivers to the committee which is organized for the development of interstate commerce and declare now that, inasmuch as the subjects relating to interstate commerce have constantly increased, coming under the jurisdiction of this committee, this subject shall also be added.

What I fear is that, if we permit, against the individual judgment of the Members of this body, a big measure like this, with many defects, to pass upon the assumption that it has in it more of good than of bad, we will lose the opportunity of broad, comprehensive legislation upon this subject, which can be spurred on only by necessity. If those interested in the various projects realize that they can get only what they want by the perfection of the system, they will hurry to perfect the system.

I am very unwilling myself to take any obstructive attitude with reference to any legislation; but if ever there was a condition that warranted it it is now. For two sessions river and harbor bills—I think for two sessions—have been rejected by Congress, and we have been compelled to resort to lump-sum appropriations. That very condition shows that the system is at fault and that there is a widespread dissatisfaction with it, which is reflected not only here but throughout the country; and it seems to me that Senators may well now consider whether this is not the time to seize for appropriate work and whether if this opportunity is lost it can be recovered in the future.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I would commend to Congress the wise advice given by one of the world's great thinkers:

Be wise to-day; 'tis madness to defer;
Next day the fatal precedent will plead:
Thus on, till wisdom is push'd out of life.

The discussion of this bill has been of peculiar interest to me. The variety of views expressed and the multiplicity of plans proposed reveal the marvelous mechanism and the winding ways of man's mentality. The different viewpoints, the angles at which the question is seen, and the conclusions reached afford an interesting study in psychology.

My good friend the learned and patriotic junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] finds little good in the measure, and with tears in his voice he solemnly assures the Senate that his sense of duty is so outraged by this legislative enormity that he is utterly helpless from any point of consideration to square an act in support of this bill as consonant with his sense of obligation to his constituents. Therefore he is compelled to maintain an attitude of relentless antagonism to it. In this determination he is very ably assisted by the erudite, persistent, and patriotic Senators from Nebraska and Wisconsin. Notwithstanding the fact that the system of river and harbor improve-

ment is of long standing and the policy an ancient one, if such a term may be used with reference to anything in America, which has repeatedly received the unqualified approval of the American people in their national political platforms and at the polls, viewed through the glasses used by these able Senators and measured by the standard employed by them it is a veritable thing from Nazareth, out of which no good could possibly come.

Mr. President, there is not anything conceived in the brain or constructed by the hand of finite, fallible man that is perfect. One who recognizes man's mental and moral limitations, and the great variety of interests to be subserved, would not expect this measure, or any other measure, that might originate with this body to be free of all objectionable features. Certainly the proponents of this bill do not claim for it perfection, or in very large degree the elements of inerrancy. But it is as good as its predecessors. It is as good as the men who framed it, and the men who framed it are as good as any other men who occupy places in this Chamber or hold membership in the Congress.

Now, let us see how this bill was created, the multiplicity of interests it is intended to serve, and the various sections of our common country where these interests are located. From the east to the west, the north to the south, contributions are made to this proposed piece of legislation. It is intended to take care of the waterways of New England, down our eastern coast to Florida, from Florida around the continent to San Francisco, and from San Francisco to Alaska, and from Alaska back to the Northeast. It also serves the Middle and Western States, and the Northern, Southern, and Eastern States. There is scarcely a place an inch square on a map of America of ordinary size that does not mark the location of some interest treated by the bill. It was constructed by the Representatives in Congress of the American people from every section of the Republic—men who are here for the purpose, not of promoting personal interests, but rather of serving the interests of all the men and women who pay the taxes and bear the burdens of government. The bill is altruistic in its purposes, boldly patriotic in its design, and intended solely for the public good.

If this were a new project or an untried scheme, there might be some justification for the wholesale abuse, the conscienceless lambasting, and the cruel excoriation which this measure has received at the hands of certain honorable Members of this body. But it is not new. It is pretty nearly as old as the Republic itself.

And, as I stated a moment ago, it has received the unqualified indorsement and approval of all the important political parties in America. The great seminal idea or principle running through this bill underlies the prodigious conservation schemes which have been adopted by this Government and put into operation in the semiarid West. Its benign purpose is to facilitate commerce between the sections by deepening the channel of the great waterways, the effect of which will be to lower the freight rates and save to the people the profits which otherwise would go to the owners of the railroads and the common carriers.

Now, I am not at all wedded to the policy of digging canals or canalizing rivers for the sole purpose of controlling freight rates on railroads. That strikes me as rather an expensive expedient or policy. If I had my way about such matters, I should insist upon the Governments, State and National, regulating railroad rates, and thereby save to the taxpayers the cost of constructing waterways. But, Mr. President, I can not have my way about these things. My judgment will not be taken by all the Members of Congress and the American people on this or any other question. No man can hope to have that degree of consideration given his views. There is no infallibly wise, benevolent despot in this country to whom these matters may be referred for prudent and perfect arrangement. So I shall do that which every rational and patriotic servant of the people in the legislative department of the Government ought to do. I shall take the next best thing. I am not going to say, because the Senator differs with me, that the scheme he proposes is a dishonest scheme, designed to rob and plunder the Treasury, and to misuse the money collected from the people by taxation. If I had had my way in framing this bill, very probably I should have eliminated some of the old projects that are scarcely worth the money spent upon them, and put in their stead new and more meritorious projects. But I did not have my way and I can not have my way. Now, because I can not have my way, I am not willing to destroy the whole system—a system that has been employed not only in America but in every civilized country beneath the stars, both in ancient and modern times, with the net result of positive good to the people of the respective countries where it has been tried.

Mr. President, I have not reached that point yet—and God forbid that I may ever reach it—where I shall feel that I have a corner on all the patriotism and wisdom in the Congress of the United States. It may be uncharitable on my part, but I can not refrain from a sneaking suspicion that every man who admits his own infallibility is not the true glitter that comes from the genuine gold. I am willing to join with my colleagues in an effort to work out, develop, and perfect, as nearly as we can, this bill. If I should conclude after the work is finished that the bad outweighs the good, then I shall do what I concede it to be the right of every other Senator to do—vote against the measure. But, after all, it is a matter of judgment rather than a question of moral turpitude.

Mr. President, I was very much impressed a few days ago with an address delivered in this Chamber by the venerable and honorable Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. His long service in this body and his well-known devotion to the interests of the common people of America entitle anything that he might say to serious and respectful consideration. Senator TILLMAN has said a great many good things on the floor of the Senate in days gone by which challenged my admiration and commanded my highest approval. He said those things when it required courage to say them, and he did many things which it required the highest order of patriotic courage to do. For that reason I confess to a degree of disappointment when I heard him utter these words:

We need the money so much for more important things that it is criminal, to my mind, to hesitate for one moment or discuss this bill at all. Think of it! Forty million dollars to be wasted and taxes to be heavily increased. That forty millions would build two battle cruisers. No one knows how many submarines it would build, and I can only guess how many airships and other things of that sort we could buy with it.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina can not be more solicitous about the future welfare of this great Republic than I am. I yield to no man in my love of country and willingness to make a sacrifice in its interest. He and I may differ as to the methods, the extent, the time, and the occasion for preparation for defense; but about the ends to be served, I dare say, there is very little difference between us. I want an adequate navy, one capable of defending the rights of the American people against any power that may dare to violate those rights. And I think we have such a navy. Love for this Republic and patriotic concern for its future are not new impulses or novel passions. It is the common attribute of the American citizen, and has been from the formation of the Government to the present day. "Preparedness" has become a fad, and the much talk about it is rather a cheap method of advertisement. It is heard more from the lips of that character of our citizenship who in the past have shown less patriotism in thoughts and less altruism in action than any other class of our people.

Of course, I will not question the purposes or the loftiness of their motives; but the fact remains that many of this vociferous, opulent breed of militant patriots, famed for their much speaking, will be pecuniarily benefited by carrying out their suggested plans for "preparedness." Of course, it may be that pelf and patriotism, profits and "preparedness" are mere co-incidents. It is not my province to judge. But if we are to prepare for war—which I myself do not think at all imminent—that fact will in no wise justify this Congress in failing to carry out the promises made to the people of America in our platform with reference to waterway improvements by cleaning out the streams, leveeing the rivers, and deepening the harbors.

I believe that a platform promise imposes an obligation that can not lightly be thrown aside, and I have never regarded a platform promise as molasses with which to catch flies or for the purpose of getting votes.

It is my good fortune, Mr. President, to represent in part in this Chamber a people who are vitally interested in the passage of this bill. There are several streams of minor importance within the limits of the State of Mississippi. The harbors on the Gulf coast afford access to the ships from every land, which come to our coast to bear away great cargoes of freight to the world's market. But the great item—the project of paramount importance to them in this bill—is the Mississippi River and the protection of the great Mississippi Delta, the most fertile section of our common country, inhabited by hundreds of thousands of patriotic, enterprising, happy people—people living behind the levee—and the preservation of whose homes depend upon the passage of this bill.

It has been said that the Mississippi River is the "drainage ditch" for more than one-half of this Republic in North America. The water that falls on 32 States finds its way to the sea through the channel of this wonderful stream. Of course, the people on the bank of the lower Mississippi can not afford—it is

a physical and financial impossibility—the expense of deepening the channel and leveeing its banks so as to hold this vast volume of water within the channel without Government aid. Mr. President, the Government of the United States alone is capable of solving that problem, and a failure on the part of the Congress at this session to take such action as the exigency and the magnitude of the problem demand will involve a betrayal of a sacred trust.

The residents of the great Delta of the Mississippi Valley, I am sure, Mr. President, will not listen with very much patience or approval to the suggestion made by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] when he suggests that it is of more importance that the money proposed to be appropriated by this bill be used for the protection of their homes and firesides from the devastation of the floods, should go to build battleships and other instruments of death, which, I know, are not needed now. With all due respect to the venerable and highly honored Senator, I think the suggestion is a little short of monstrous. It only shows to what extremes man may go when obsessed with some vague and indescribable apprehension of impending disaster. It is the effect of the policies of falsehood injected into the veins of the body politic by the wild advocates of preparedness. Since the days of John Law, with his Mississippi Bubble, I do not think a more palpable fraud has ever been attempted to be perpetrated upon a patriotic, intelligent people than is being attempted at this time by the interested advocates of "preparedness."

Mr. President, in my support of the measure before the Senate I trust I shall be able to rise above all sectional considerations, that the egotistical element may be wholly lacking in my conduct. I sincerely hope that I may be able to demean myself as an American Senator should act charged with the responsibility and the duty of conserving the interests of the Nation. While I know that I am not wholly free or exempt from the influences, environment, and the considerations of personal, selfish interests, I am going to try in this instance, as I have universally endeavored to do since I became a Member of this body, to rise above those distorting and warping influences and to live and act that broad, selfish altruism, which, to my mind, is the highest evidence of man's fitness for legislative duties. In being true to myself and the best and higher interest of my immediate constituents I can not be false to my colleagues and untrue to my country.

The time has arrived, I think, when the Senate should take action in this matter. Free and full discussion, exhaustive discussion, has been had; and now we owe it to the American people, our masters, to take definite and certain action.

But there is another snag in the stream that we have encountered, which I shall notice briefly. The erudite, far-seeing senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] has a scheme of marvelous magnitude, which he has, with the pertinacity of purpose that characterized the elder Cato in his antagonism to Carthage, urged upon the attention of the Senate of the United States. I trust, Mr. President, that I may at this juncture be permitted to pay to the honorable Senator the tribute of my respect and admiration. He is one of those splendid dreamers whose vision permits him to stand within the shadow of the night and look beyond it toward the coming light and see, far off, with trance-prophetic eye, the consummation of the centuries. Maybe he is just a little bit ahead of his time. I know that the American people can not afford or expect his wonderful plan, so marvelous in its conception, intricate in its details, and, to my mind, well nigh impossible of operation, to be put into effect at this time. So far-reaching, vast, and comprehensive is the system offered by the able Senator that he proposes by "cooperation and coordination" of some sort to take possession of the water from the time the mist in the heaven is condensed into the drop of rain, conduct it to the earth, harness it, control it, and direct its course until it becomes a part of the great restless, rolling sea.

He would extract the fertilizing qualities from the drop of rain and with it enrich the earth. He would use the kindly moisture to encourage the growth of the young and tender plants. He would hang the dewdrop upon the flower, and through the reflected rays of the sun study the colors of the rainbow with all its neutral tints. He would control the waterways of the land by impounding the rainfall, create the power that would generate the electricity to light the world, and turn the wheels of industry; he would direct the current and control the flow of the streams upon whose placid bosom the commerce of the nation might float; he would follow the water into the sea, and after he had directed it through all of its meanderings, he could then withdraw himself from the "madding crowd's ignoble strife," seek seclusion upon some tropical Morro, where he might sit with the tragic poet of old, and

"listen to the multitudinous laughter of the sea," and peacefully, with infinite pride, contemplate the marvelous work of his wonderful scheme. A more ambitious undertaking never stirred the brain of man, and, I might add, no such scheme was ever accomplished.

Mr. President, nothing short of Omnipotence could carry out this scheme. The despot who built the Pyramids accomplished an inconsequential undertaking compared with the magnitude of this stupendous project. If some modern Sesostris wielded the scepter of absolute authority at Washington, and all the American people were his slaves, and that great ruler should be possessed of the vision of all the poets, the combined wisdom of all the philosophers, and the tested skill of all the engineers of ancient and modern times, I am persuaded that probably in the course of a century he might be able to carry out the tremendous undertaking proposed by the senior Senator from Nevada.

Of course, I am not entirely sure about the length of time it might require, but I am sure it would take at least a century to accomplish what the Senator from Nevada has in his mind. Not having in hand all of those influences and forces to employ, it seems to me, Mr. President, an unwarranted prodigality of time to consider further the Senator's pet project.

Let us pass this bill and conserve the lands of the great delta which are liable to destruction by devastating floods. Let us deepen the harbors, that the products of our fields, forests, and factories may be floated out to sea and carried to the peoples of the world who need them. Let us deepen the channels of the rivers, that our domestic commerce may be facilitated; that the consumer may be given cheaper freight rates; and the interests of the toilers of all America be promoted. I will go further: I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senators from the great West in carrying out the plans already inaugurated for the reclamation of the arid lands of the West that happy homes may be made for the homeless and that prosperity and abundance may be vouchsafed to our people.

The future of America is in the keeping of the country home. Free institutions find their enduring foundation upon the home, away from the congested centers—with that class of our people who live close to nature and nature's God, whose labor is remunerative, healthful, and inspiring. In the heart of the American farmer burns the unquenchable fire of patriotism which shall save this Republic from the corroding influences of sordid materialism which is eating out the hearts of the money lovers and stifling the speechless, longings of the heart of the indigent unfortunates who live in the congested districts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the motion of the Senator from Iowa regarding the Brazos River, I think it proper that a brief answer should be made to his allegations.

I desire to direct the attention of the Senate to the recommendations of the engineer who examined the Brazos River, and on whose report the present project is based.

The examining engineer was Capt.—now Col.—Edgar Jadwin, one of the ablest members of the Engineer Corps. His report was practically a continuation of a report by Col. C. S. Riché, who initiated the preliminary examination, and who is one of the most brilliant members of the corps. Jadwin said:

Having in mind the existing development of the valley, the fact that it lies in the center of the State, is traversed by three railroads, produces about one-third of the cotton crop of the State, and probably half the crop of the State passes through it now by rail; that Texas is the principal cotton State, producing an average of about 2,500,000 bales, worth about \$50 per bale—

That was some 10 years ago. The cotton production of Texas is now somewhere between four and five million bales, worth about \$50 a bale—

that there is no water transportation in the section from Washington to Waco; that this improvement will put the section in water communication with the largest cotton port in the United States; the results obtained elsewhere where water competition has been afforded, the possibility of an extension of the improvement farther inland above Waco, if required, and the relatively low cost and the quickness with which the result can, with adequate appropriations, be obtained to Waco, it is evident that the proposed improvement is especially meritorious, and that the basic conditions show it to be a project worthy to be undertaken by the United States.

On the strength of that report, Congress inaugurated the present project, and provided for the erection of two locks and dams—two of the eight locks and dams which Capt. Jadwin said would be necessary in order to complete the project.

The territory tributary to the Brazos contains about 31,084 square miles, a territory nearly as large as Indiana, larger than South Carolina or West Virginia, and within 1,000 square miles of being the size of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Maryland combined. While this section is only about one-eighth of the entire area of Texas, it has more than a third of the population of the State, and produces one and

one-half million bales of cotton, which is more than one-third of the cotton crop of Texas, and nearly one-tenth of the cotton crop of the entire world.

Of course, Mr. President, no commerce of any respectable size can possibly develop on the river until the entire project has been completed, until the eight locks and dams have been constructed between the mouth of the Brazos and Waco, the head of navigation. Waco is a city of some 40,000 people. It has seven railroad trunk lines. Within a few months the interurban railway has been completed from the Red River section and Dallas. A pipe line for natural gas from the Mexia field has been constructed. Waco does \$70,000,000 worth of wholesale business annually. It is the center of the most thoroughly populated section of Texas, and it is the largest inland cotton market in the world.

At the mouth of the Brazos, Mr. President, a deep-water port has already been established—a port that now has a minimum depth of 18 feet, and one of the largest fuel-oil concerns in the world is establishing extensive warehouses there. This concern has indicated its intention of barging its oil to Waco as soon as the river has been improved, and of building at Waco a storage plant with a capacity of 600,000 barrels. One of the largest sulphur deposits in the world is being developed near Freeport. The tonnage transported from that port to the markets of the world amounted to 53,133 tons in 1913, 104,281 tons in 1914, and 152,945 tons in 1915. Three steamships make regular calls at Freeport, at the mouth of the Brazos, each month, and do a large business. I shall give the Senate the names of some of the boats that are now operating between the mouth of the Brazos and the ports of the world.

They are the *Kennebec*, the *Honduras*, the *Algiers*, the *Fredrick Luckenbach*, the *Wilhelmina*, the *Wm. P. Palmer*, the *Carolina*, the *Francis Hanify*, and so forth. Now, the improvement of the Brazos River will connect this important port with a large part of the interior of Texas and will put that important territory in touch with the markets of the world. I know of no waterway proposition that has greater possibilities than this Brazos River project.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if the town of Freeport, at the mouth of the Brazos River, has railway connections?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It has. The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railroad, one of the large trunk systems of the Southwest, now has railroad connection with Freeport, and the other principal trunk lines of our section are preparing to make similar connection.

Let me say one other thing. The Senator criticized the fact that there was to be a depth of only 3½ or 4 feet from the mouth of the Brazos to Waco. That is an entirely sufficient depth for an extensive barge service. Why, Mr. President, on the Rhone in France, from Le Parc, near the Swiss boundary, to Lyon, a section 95 miles long, the navigable draft is only 1.3 feet, and yet the traffic on that section in 1905 was 160,000 tons. On the Rhone, from Lyon to Arles, a distance of 178 miles, the navigable draft is 3.3 feet; and boats of this draft on the Rhone to-day carry 400 to 500 tons and are from 400 to 430 feet long. The traffic on this section in 1905 amounted to 750,000 tons.

More than that, the Oder is one of the principal rivers of western Germany. It has six divisions: First, from its junction with the Neisse to Breslau, 46 miles, with a depth at mean low water of from 2.6 to 3 feet; second, from Breslau to Furstenburg, 185 miles, with a depth at mean low water of 3 feet; third, from Furstenburg to Kustrin, 38 miles, with a depth at mean low water of 3.3 feet; fourth, from Kustrin to the junction with the Finow Canal, 31 miles, with a depth at mean low water of 4.2 feet; fifth, from the Finow Canal to Stettin, 49 miles, with a depth at mean low water of from 5 to 8.7 feet; sixth, from Stettin to the sea, an estuary of 20 miles; total, 349 miles. The traffic on this river in 1905 was 4,200,000 tons; and of that amount, Mr. President, 1,107,000 tons were received and dispatched at Breslau, where the river in one direction has a depth of from 2.6 to 3 feet and in another direction of only 3 feet.

In order to show the possibilities of shallow-draft navigation, let me say, further, that of the 22,238 boats on German waters in 1905, 10,443 were boats carrying from 10 to 150 tons. It is evident that an inland barge traffic could be established on the Brazos with the greatest ease, and an inland waterway of tremendous benefit not only to Texas but to the entire Southwest developed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator if he really believes that the business upon the waterways of France and Germany can be duplicated on the Brazos or any other river until the present methods of those countries in land transportation and the control of railways are established in this country?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think so.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the Senator know that if we should expend enough money on the Brazos to give it a depth of 10 feet, with the opposition of the railways to the waterways of the country, it would not get the traffic, and could not hold it if it did, and that any attempt to establish it to any serious degree would result not only in railway competition but in the practical destruction by the railways even of its potential business?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not think so, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator name any stream, in Texas or elsewhere, on which there is a substantial and continued increase of water traffic where there is railroad competition?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Oh, yes; the waterway from Duluth to New York.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I said any small watercourse. I admit, of course, that the instance to which the Senator refers is one in which there is an increase in traffic; but the Senator knows that it is not necessary there to spend millions to get 2 or 3 feet of water. He also knows that there is communication from the upper regions of Lake Superior clear to the seaboard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not originally. They had to construct a part of that waterway through dry land. They had to connect Lake Ontario with the Hudson River by constructing a canal through the soil.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and also the Welland Canal through the soil, capable of accommodating enormous boats. The Senator knows that that is a part of a waterway which is substantial and which connects great bodies of water with each other and is not the expenditure of money upon a stream which leads into the interior part of the country where the railways dominate the traffic and where they always will dominate it until the Government shall reach out its strong hand and compel them to cooperate, just as they are required to cooperate in France and in Germany. It seems to me we are beginning this whole subject wrong side to. Let us get control of the railways and then, by virtue of that control, we will be enabled to make the same arrangement with reference to boat traffic and general traffic that is made in the case to which the Senator calls attention.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why, Mr. President, the railroads will never dominate the traffic of the country if waterways are properly managed, because the railroads have not sufficient capacity to carry the traffic which this country is capable of developing. I would never advocate the improvement of waterways merely on the ground of its influence on railroad rates. I advocate the improvement of waterways primarily because they establish new and additional systems of transportation. Mr. James J. Hill said some years ago that it would require an expenditure of \$5,000,000,000 a year for the next 5 or 10 years in order to enable the railroads to keep pace with the material development of which the country was capable.

Mr. President, in that fact may be found the prime necessity for waterways. We need the additional facilities of transportation afforded by water routes in order that the country may have its highest development and growth, a development and growth which can not materialize as long as transportation is confined to railroads with their limited capacity.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I hate to oppose any proposition in which my friend from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is interested, but it does seem to me that this is one item in this bill that we can very well cut out at this time, at any rate.

I want to call attention to what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENTON] said, merely by way of emphasis.

We are not dealing in this amendment with the mouth of the Brazos River. We are not dealing with the situation that will be created when the project that was recommended by the engineers is completed. What we are dealing with is the improvement of the river from Old Washington to Waco.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I endeavored to show the desirability of connecting the port at the mouth of the Brazos with Waco by a barge line, and of enabling the interior of the State to utilize that port by means of the improvement of the Brazos River.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes; I understood the purpose of the Senator. But, Mr. President, this appropriation will not make any connection that will be available for navigation. As a matter of fact, Congress has not yet approved or adopted the project that was recommended by the engineers. The engineers said that to get this depth of 3½ feet at certain times of the year

from Old Washington to Waco would require the building of eight locks and dams. It is expressly stated in the Engineers' report that Congress has never adopted this project. We have provided, however, for the construction of four locks and dams, and we have expended toward their completion something over a million dollars; and this appropriation is to be applied only upon the locks and dams that we have heretofore commenced constructing. They are not to begin upon any new locks and dams. So that even if the locks and dams which we have already commenced are finally completed, unless we take up the other four we will not have any navigation. We will not have any water-borne commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I know the Senator would not intentionally misinform the Senate.

Mr. JONES. No; I would not. I just want the facts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The examining engineer said that it would require eight locks and dams to secure this navigation from the mouth of the Brazos to Waco.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; from Old Washington.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Well, from Old Washington to Waco.

Mr. JONES. Is that the mouth of the river?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That gives Waco connection with the mouth. The river is easily navigable from the mouth to Old Washington. No locks and dams are necessary between the mouth and Old Washington.

Mr. JONES. Oh, I understand that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The river and harbor act of 1909 provided for a survey for the selection of sites for the additional locks and dams between Old Washington and Waco. At that time the work on Lock and Dam No. 1 had been begun. The survey was made, and the river and harbor act of 1910 carried an initial appropriation of \$75,000 for Lock and Dam No. 8.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If Congress provided for Lock and Dam No. 1 and Lock and Dam No. 8, and also provided for a survey to locate the intervening locks and dams, it certainly adopted the project.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the basis of my statement was this: In the report on the river and harbor bill in the House, submitted by Mr. SPARKMAN, it is said:

This project has not been adopted as a whole—

Mr. SHEPPARD. That statement is evidently erroneous.

Mr. JONES. It goes on to say:

But Lock and Dam No. 1 at Hidalgo Falls was authorized by the river and harbor act approved March 2, 1907; Lock and Dam No. 8 by the act approved June 25, 1910; and Locks and Dams Nos. 3 and 6 by the act approved July 25, 1912.

In other words, Congress has simply been making appropriations for different locks and dams within the limits of the project recommended by the engineers, but Congress itself has never yet finally adopted the entire project. Now, what the special reason was for adopting Lock No. 8, and beginning its construction before beginning the construction of Lock No. 6 or the other locks, I do not know; but the situation is just that way.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, when the former Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, was conducting his famous filibuster against the river and harbor bill two years ago, he prepared a substitute containing those projects which evidently he deemed worthy, or he would not have included them in the substitute, and that substitute contained the following language:

Improving Brazos River, Tex.: Continuing improvement from Old Washington to Waco by the construction of locks and dams heretofore authorized, \$200,000.

The language of this clause shows that the project for locks and dams as outlined in the survey authorized in 1909 had been adopted, in the opinion of Mr. Burton. Furthermore, the fact that this clause was inserted by Mr. Burton shows that he considered the project worthy of prosecution. As a matter of fact, the present bill merely provides for beginning construction work on Locks and Dams Nos. 3 and 6, approved and authorized by the act of July 25, 1912, as quoted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. While I have very great respect for the opinion of former Senator Burton, yet I take it that his judgment is not conclusive in matters of this character.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if his contention is not borne out by the fact that this bill makes provision for an instrumental survey of the Brazos River, and also for another survey, on pages 50 and 51, and whether that provision would have been made for a project which had been actually adopted by Congress?

Mr. JONES. I think that is true; and, as I understand from the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], provision was made in preceding bills for a resurvey of this river, the report

upon which has not yet been submitted to Congress. If that is the case, then it seems to me that it is an added reason why we should leave out this appropriation.

We talk about the need for money and the need for economizing and the need for saving money. Here is an appropriation that will not accomplish anything unless this entire project is completed. We have directed a survey for the purpose of eliciting a further report to Congress. Why can we not very well just leave out this appropriation until we get the report on this survey, and then determine whether or not we are going to complete the project?

I do not say that this project ought not to be completed. I am not opposing the entire proposition. I am simply presenting the question upon the facts as they are now, as to whether or not we ought to put this item in the bill. The putting in of all of these eight locks may be a splendid thing, and I may be for it when the time comes to do that; but I do say that if we are going to do it, then we ought to do it just as quickly as possible. We have spent now over a million dollars on this project and it has not brought us one cent's worth of benefit.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It can not bring any benefit until the project is completed.

Mr. JONES. That is exactly it. If we are going to complete the project, we ought to provide for its completion, and instead of appropriating \$200,000 here we ought to appropriate over a million dollars, which is necessary to put in every lock and dam that will make it available for navigation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then every other project the completion of which has not been provided for in this bill ought to go out also?

Mr. JONES. Yes; every one similarly situated, with the conditions the same as this, ought either to go out or provision ought to be made for its completion, one or the other. I am not saying that it ought to go out for the best interests of the Government, but it ought to go out or it ought to be completed, one or the other.

One of the sources of great waste in connection with river and harbor bills is that we commence a project which will cost a million or two million or three million dollars, and we dribble along year after year—I was going to say almost century after century—without appropriating the money that is necessary to complete it. The result is that it costs three or four times what it really would have cost had we in the beginning provided for it as we ought to have done.

That is the situation with reference to this proposition. If when the report on the survey comes in the engineers say that this project ought not to be completed, that it ought to be stopped, that the results will not be good, and Congress should accept that decision, then we will have wasted this \$200,000 appropriation. If the report comes in and says it will be a good thing and we ought to do it, then we will have lost nothing. We can then make the appropriation, and, in my judgment, we should make an appropriation sufficient to complete the project, and complete it quickly.

We can lose nothing by cutting out this item. We may lose it all by leaving it in. It will not bring any good to commerce, because they say here, and the Senator has said, that there can be no commerce until the whole project recommended by the engineers is completed. Unless we are determined, notwithstanding any report that may come in on this new survey, that we are going to go on and complete this project, I say we ought to stop now and wait and see what that report is; and if we are determined to finish the work, let us appropriate whatever amount is necessary to construct every dam and get the commerce which will be developed from that project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I do not think the exact form of the question is understood.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to strike out, on page 23, after line 20, the following words:

Brazos River, Tex.: Continuing improvement from Old Washington to Waco by the construction of locks and dams heretofore authorized, \$200,000.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. In his absence, and not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CORT]

to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. He is absent, so I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I understand that I am at liberty to vote upon this particular amendment, and I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On this vote I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] which, in his absence, I transfer to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE], and vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] to my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] and vote "nay."

Mr. LIPPITT. I inquire if the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. LIPPITT. As I have a pair with that Senator, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (after having voted in the negative). I transferred my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], who has since entered the Chamber and voted. I now transfer my pair to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. TOWNSEND (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], but notwithstanding that I have voted because of an arrangement or understanding I had with him which permits me to do so.

Mr. HARDWICK (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. HARDWICK. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kansas to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and will allow my vote in the negative to stand.

Mr. ASHURST. I rise to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is unavoidably detained. He has been called to one of the departments on an important matter.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]; and

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Ashurst	Cummins	Kenyon	Smoot
Borah	Fall	Kern	Sterling
Brady	Gallinger	La Follette	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Gore	Lodge	Taggart
Catron	Husting	Norris	Thompson
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Sherman	Wadsworth

NAYS—33.

Bankhead	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Stone
Broussard	Lewis	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Tillman
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Underwood
Clarke, Ark.	Myers	Shields	Vardaman
Culbertson	Nelson	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Hardwick	Owen	Smith, Md.	
Lane	Polindexter	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—35.

Beckham	Dillingham	Hitchcock	Lee, Md.
Bryan	du Pont	Hollis	Lippitt
Burleigh	Goff	Hughes	McCumber
Colt	Gronna	James	McLean
Curtis	Harding	Johnson, Me.	Newlands

O'Gorman
Page
Penrose
Phelan

Pittman
Pomerene
Robinson
Shafroth

Smith, Ariz.
Smith, S. C.
Thomas
Walsh

Warren
Weeks
Works

So Mr. KENYON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I desire to say that it will be impossible to dispose of any other item in the bill this afternoon, and I ask that it be laid aside until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

I move that when the Senate takes a recess this afternoon it be until 12 o'clock to-morrow. There will be a meeting of the Committee on Commerce to-morrow morning, and that is the reason why I make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9533) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 10490. An act to prevent fraudulent advertising in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 12027. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 12766. An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14771. An act granting the consent of Congress to commissioners of Charlton County, Ga., and Nassau County, Fla., to construct a bridge across the St. Marys River; and

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to provide for holding the Texas Bicentennial and Pan American Exposition in 1918.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Sawtelle, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COLT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Warren, R. I., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wyoming, Harrington, and Port Penn, all in the State of Delaware, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the grading of grain, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against sectarian appropriations, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS presented a petition of the Montana Branch of the Parent-Teacher Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide expeditious adjudication of pending State selections of school lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Terry, Mont., praying for the settlement of disputes between railroads and their employees by arbitration, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Manhattan, Kans., praying for the establishment of engineering experiment stations in connection with land-grant colleges, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kans., remonstrating against any further appropriations for the enforcement of the migratory-bird law, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Rotary Club of Leavenworth, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Shields water-power bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of 960 farmers of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Jackson, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Sebewaing, Mich., remonstrating against the action of Great Britain in prohibiting the sending of Red Cross supplies to Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Commerce of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of stop-watch and labor-measuring devices in Government arsenals, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LIPPITT presented a petition of 22 citizens of Providence, R. I., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 5344) for the regulation of the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 480) thereon.

Mr. OWEN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13391) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act by adding a new section, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 481) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 6137) granting a pension to Mary E. Gilbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 6138) granting an increase of pension to Hugh O. Neville;

A bill (S. 6139) granting an increase of pension to Charles Apple;

A bill (S. 6140) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus B. Capron; and

A bill (S. 6141) granting an increase of pension to Madeline A. Rowell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 6142) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Flint (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 6143) granting a pension to David Noe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 6144) granting an increase of pension to Lydia C. Stevenson;

A bill (S. 6145) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Farris, jr.; and

A bill (S. 6146) granting an increase of pension to George L. Wait Wiltbank, alias George L. Wait; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 6147) fixing the compensation of inspectors of customs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 6148) to establish a horse-breeding station in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 6149) for the relief of the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 6150) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Ray;

A bill (S. 6151) granting an increase of pension to George Ellars; and

A bill (S. 6152) granting an increase of pension to Charles Blitz (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) requesting the President to invite the Governments of Japan and China to join in the formation of an international commission to study the questions at issue between the Orient and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to investigate the grading, weighing, handling, and transportation of naval stores, the preparation of definite type samples thereof, and for the demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. ASHURST submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the elimination and eradication of the purple loco weed, the white loco weed, and other poisonous leguminous weeds in Arizona, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the National Dairy Show Association to be held at Springfield, Mass., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 12717), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the improvement of New Hampshire Avenue NW., from Grant Circle to Oregon Avenue, in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 15774), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER HIGHWAY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, through the enterprise of the people of Oregon a magnificent scenic highway has been constructed along the south bank of the Columbia River from Astoria to The Dalles, a distance of more than 200 miles. The construction of this highway has involved an immense expenditure, contributed by the State and its citizens. World travelers declare this to be the greatest road ever built to meet the conditions of modern traffic. Gen. George W. Goethals, in speaking of it, said: "It is a splendid job of engineering and absolutely without equal for scenic interest in America." Other distinguished engineers have spoken of this great highway in the same complimentary terms.

Many thousands of our citizens will visit the Pacific coast during the present season as a part of their vacation and will have an opportunity to pass over and along one of the most beautiful rivers of the country. The changes which have come to the West since President Thomas Jefferson sent his confidential message to Congress that resulted in the sending of Lewis and Clark into the unexplored regions beyond the Rocky Mountains and down the Columbia River to the Pacific is truly wonderful; the land which President Jefferson spoke of as "That vast and fertile country which their sons are determined to fill with arts, with science, with freedom, and with happiness."

The governor of the State has set apart Wednesday, June 7, 1916, as a day for celebrating the formal opening of the Columbia River Highway, and the people of the State of Oregon are anxious to have an invitation extended to those mentioned in the resolution which I send to the desk and for which I ask that unanimous consent be given for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 200) was read, as follows:

Whereas the people of Oregon have constructed a great highway, which extends from the wheat fields of eastern Oregon, "the Inland Empire," to the Pacific coast, passing through the Cascade Range and the Gorge of the Columbia; and

Whereas the Columbia River Highway is declared by world travelers to be the greatest road ever built to meet the conditions of modern traffic; and

Whereas the governor of the State of Oregon has declared Wednesday, June 7, to be the day set aside for celebrating its formal opening: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and respectfully requested, in such manner as he may deem proper, to invite the diplomatic representatives of foreign Governments with embassies or legations in Washington, D. C., to participate in celebrating this historic event.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

MR. SMOOT'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that there may be no question regarding appropriations to be made hereafter to pay the expenses of delegates to this celebration, I submit the following, and ask for its adoption.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 201) as follows:

Resolved, That no appropriation shall be granted at any time hereafter in connection with the celebration of the formal opening of the Columbia River Highway, to be held Wednesday, June 7, 1916.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

THE COASTWISE TRADE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask to have printed as a public document the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to corporate interests of railroads in vessels or steamship lines engaged in transporting freight between Atlantic and Pacific ports and in the coastwise trade of the United States. The cost, I will say, will be \$92.26, according to the estimate of the Public Printer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then, I ask that the document be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to its publication.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPERIMENT STATIONS IN ENGINEERING (S. DOC. NO. 446).

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document certain correspondence, being a letter from Dr. W. R. Whitney, chairman of the committee on chemistry and physics of the United States Naval Consulting Board, and a circular letter dated April 29, 1916, written by Dr. Whitney, to various citizens throughout the country, extracts from replies of these gentlemen to Dr. Whitney, together with certain other matter relative to Senate bill 4874, proposing to establish experiment stations in engineering in State colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts. The document will comprise about 40 pages and the cost will not be very much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. OWEN. I find that five conferees have been appointed on the part of the House on the rural-credits bill (S. 2986), and I ask that there may be added to the Senate conferees the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 9533. An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 27 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., Wednesday, May 24, 1916) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, May 25, 1916, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 18), 1916.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Maj. William O. Owen, retired, to the grade of colonel in the Medical Corps, with rank from April 12, 1912.

JUDGE CIRCUIT COURT OF HAWAII.

James Wesley Thompson to be judge of the Circuit Court of the Third Circuit of the Territory of Hawaii.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Charles F. Evers, Fortuna.

KENTUCKY.

Nannie E. Butler, Elkton.
John R. White, Irvine.

LOUISIANA.

Albert Nunez, Arabi.
Lou E. Russell, West Monroe.

MISSOURI.

Thomas F. Benson, Sturgeon.
Hevner F. Hoover, Hardin.

NEW YORK.

Richard F. Hayes, Ticonderoga.
Florence L. Johnson, Elmsford.
John Lemmon, Churchville.
Timothy D. Mulcahy, Lawrence.
Benjamin B. Tooker, Center Moriches.
Wilber W. Wilcox, Lacona.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

D. C. Campbell, Wolsey.
G. A. Miller, Conde.
Frank E. Riley, Dupree.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 24, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

With profound faith and confidence in Thee, O God our heavenly Father, as the most potent factor in the affairs of men and of nations, we come to Thee in the fervency of prayer that we may feel sweeping through our souls Thy holy influence to guide us in all our transactions, that we may think well, act well our part in the affairs of life, and pass on our way rejoicing as integral parts of the great eternal plan; and Thine be the praise, through Him who taught us faith, hope, love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the oil and gasoline situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of gasoline, and so forth. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 15947) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 743), ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves all points of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the minority I ask that they have until to-morrow to submit their views.

Mr. BUTLER. Until 12 o'clock.

Mr. PADGETT. You may have all day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the minority have until to-morrow night to file their views. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OREGON & CALIFORNIA RAILROAD LAND GRANT.

The SPEAKER. There is a special order for to-day, the California-Oregon Railroad land bill, H. R. 14864.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 14864; and pending that I want to see if we can agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] for time. Would two hours be agreeable for general debate?

Mr. LENROOT. I have applications for two hours on this side without using any time myself. I had hoped we might agree upon two hours on a side.